# JOURNAL
## OF
# CALENDAR REFORM

EDITORS
CHARLES D. MORRIS CHARLES C. SUTTER

*Published by*
THE WORLD CALENDAR ASSOCIATION
485 Madison Avenue, New York City
ELISABETH ACHELIS, *President*

VOL. IV DECEMBER, 1934 No. 4


# CLUBWOMEN LOOK AT REFORM

*By* MARGARET BECKER KULP

*Executive Secretary of the Pennsylvania State Federation of Women's Clubs*

CLUBWOMEN, generally speaking, seem to know little or nothing of the international movement for calendar reform. This is a great pity, for all over the civilized world women of today are thinking for themselves, and they are eager to study matters of national and international importance. They are unaware, for the most part, that there is a growing conviction throughout the world that the old Gregorian Calendar which we are still using in the twentieth century is defective, awkward, and cumbersome, and that the time has come to consider seriously a calendar of balance and permanent regularity. They do not know that the matter of calendar revision is of such importance to the nations of the world that the League of Nations has been considering the subject and will discuss it again in a plenary session which will be called to meet at Geneva in 1936.

The modern clubwoman would never dream of discarding her smart little wrist watch to compute the time by the old-fashioned sundial. Nor would she oppose any progressive measure of calendar reform if she knew the facts.

Clubwomen, because they are women, are economical. They would approve of the method of calendar reform which would be the least costly.

Clubwomen are efficient. They would certainly endorse the method

most simple in its operation, most consistent in its form, and least disturbing in the transition of its adoption.

Clubwomen are progressive in their work and in their thinking. They are interested in studying all sides of a question, and will work for any movement that will bring an improvement in conditions, and they will not allow mere inertia to prevent a change that will obviously be helpful to all future generations.

Above all, clubwomen are intelligent. They should be given the opportunity to know more about calendar reform, and the probability is that they would support it if they understood it. A small pamphlet for study might be effective. A pamphlet that would state facts clearly and not too technically. The obvious channel of approach would be, of course, through the clubs.

Clubs and organizations that would welcome the study plan are legion. We could have used material to great advantage at the program conference of the State Federation of Pennsylvania Women in annual convention last October. The matter of calendar revision based on the twelve-month plan of The World Calendar Association was presented, and the clubs were asked to study all plans of reform through their departments of international relations and legislation and compare their merits. It was suggested that a complete program outline might be worked out under the general subject, "The Story of the Calendar," in which the histories of the ancient calendars be taken up as well as the Julian and Gregorian and the French Revolutionary Calendars, the several calendars of India, and the new calendar of Russia. The suggestion intrigued many program chairmen and they inquired for material. When they have sifted out the imperfections of our present calendar and compared all reform plans, they doubtless will be satisfied with, and will advocate the plan offered by The World Calendar Association.

In passing we mention only a few of the large organizations of women that exist permanently and whose voices are heard around the world: The National and International Councils of Women; the University Women of America, and the International Federation of University Women in which forty countries are represented; the General Federation of Women's Clubs with its huge membership comprised of a state federation in every state in the Union and a membership of 50,000 or more in foreign and territorial clubs; International Quota; the Business and Professional Women's Groups; the American Nurses' Association and Allied Organizations; the International Council of Nurses which reaches out into thirty-three countries; the Northern Congress of Parents and Teachers, with its membership of one and a half millions, and the International Council of Home and School.

The World Calendar ought to appeal to clubwomen who are in business

and professions because of its symmetry and stability. It is simple in its arrangement and perpetual in its form. It is rhythmic in its equal division of the twelve months of the year into halves and quarters, and it is precise in regulating the days and dates of the year. Much of the confusion now existing in banking, accounting, comparison of business records at stated intervals, and the tabulation of business statistics, would be lifted forever if this form of calendar revision should be adopted for our permanent and perpetual use.

When one considers that in these days of organized freedom woman walks breast to breast with man in the fields of industry, business and the professions, has entered the realms of economics, science and invention, and sits in the places of the most high in governmental service and administration, it would seem that her voice would carry far in the setting up of a calender that would penetrate into the very fibre of industrial, professional, financial or statistical life. And when one further considers that 63 per cent of all the inherited wealth in the United States is owned by women, surely one must realize that woman today has both position and power, and that her voice must be heard in matters that concern patterns of living.

A stabilized Easter on April 8, as proposed in The World Calendar would meet the approval of clubwomen, and they would be interested to know that the movable dates of Easter and other holy dates have been matters of great concern to many of the churches. Mothers and teachers should approve the simplified method of teaching The World Calendar system of the months and days of the year to the child in the school. What could be more heartening than to know that once one has learned this perpetual form of calendar it will be a lesson learned for all time? And the harassed club program chairman, who finds it difficult to count past the end of a calendar year, and who is unable to find a calendar to arrange her days and dates for the next year's program, what a boon The World Calendar would be to her!

Clubwomen surely know, by habit and tradition, that the calendar is a vital factor in life, that it is a humanizing force around which the daily living of all peoples is centered and governed. What they may not yet realize, as a whole, is the fact that an effort for a perpetual calendar, which could be adopted by the whole world, thus unifying the calendars of the nations, would be a tremendous stride forward in international relationship, and a great adventure in the art of understanding our neighbors as ourselves.

# ENGLAND WANTS A CHANGE

*By* J. B. PERRY ROBINSON

*Assistant Secretary of the Rational Calendar Association, London*

FOR the purposes of this article, I shall assume that you are abysmally ignorant of calendar reform, although it is a big movement that has been going on for a long time. It may not even have struck you that anything need be done about the calendar. But it is 2000 years since anything important was done about it, and nearly 200 years since the English-speaking world paid any attention to it. The calendar we use isn't as you might suppose, in any way a modern or efficient or up-to-date affair. It's a queer garbled anachronism, a patchwork, a hotch-potch of astronomy, folklore and superstition.

To give you a very simple illustration why it is not efficient. E. V. Lucas, I think, points out somewhere that if a woman says "Come to dinner on Thursday the 16th"—and you find that Thursday is not the 16th, you can assume that she means you to come on *Thursday;* but if a man says "Come to dinner on Thursday the 16th," and the 16th is not a Thursday, then he means "Come on the 16th," whatever day of the week it is.

As a matter of fact these social differences of opinion, particularly between the sexes, may have very serious consequences. There was a famous divorce among the aristocracy recently, which began like this: Lord and Lady So-and-So were motoring from, say, Bournemouth down to Cornwall, and as they were crossing a particularly desolate bit of Dartmoor, Lord So-and-So suddenly said, "Bless my soul! We can't possibly go to Cornwall." "Why on earth not?" said Lady So-and-So. "Because I promised to attend a Board Meeting in Bristol on Wednesday." "But it's not Wednesday, it's Tuesday," said Lady So-and-So. "Nonsense," said Lord So-and-So, "of course it's Wednesday, and anyhow I know the meeting's today because it's the 23rd." "But," said Lady So-and-So, "I know it's Tuesday." His Lordship stopped the car. "Get out of this car!" he said. And he made her get out into the road and then he slammed the door and drove off leaving her in the middle of Dartmoor. . . . Of course, the best of it is that it was Tuesday, the 22nd!

These are simply examples of the social inconveniences of our present calendar, and as a matter of fact, one doesn't need such startling examples to be aware of them. I couldn't tell you what day of the week my birthday will fall this year. And no Englishman, unless he happens to have looked it up, can say what date August Bank Holiday, the first Monday in August, will be next year—or even what date the Derby will be, which is usually the first Wednesday in June. There are innumerable functions

which are always held on, say, the second Tuesday in September—Board Meetings, parochial councils, markets, the vicarage garden party, fairs, all sorts of things. You have probably noticed that small country churches often have services only on the 2nd and 4th Sundays in the month, or that the magistrates will sit on third Wednesdays. . . . One never knows with any of these things what real date they will be—since the 2nd Tuesday in September may be anything from the 8th to the 14th, and the 4th Sunday anywhere from the 22nd to the 28th.

The reason for this is quite simple. The weeks never fit exactly into the year. Instead of there being 52, there are 52 *and one day*, so that every year the weekdays shift one further forward through the months—or if it is a leap year, two days forward—and also the varying lengths of the months (31, 30, 29 or 28) further upset the sequence of the weeks. But more of that anon. For it is not the social inconveniences that really matter. The people who are most concerned are the men who run big businesses—banks, factories, export houses, shipping. For them it is essential to have accurate statistics of their costs and production. And the present calendar irregularities make it impossible for them to get them. But before I explain what the effects of the irregularities are, I had better explain how they arise.

I said it was 2000 years since anything practical was done about the Calendar. Two thousand years ago, in 46 B. C., Julius Caesar, as Pontifex Maximus, established the calendar roughly in the form we know it today. Ever since Romulus—who was a real person and not a Freudian sort of wolf—the Romans had used arbitrary and complicated methods of intercalation—which means putting in extra days to complete the months within the year. Caesar fixed the months, with the traditional names we used today, to have alternatively 31 and 30 days, except for February—poor February has always been the Cinderella of the calendar—which had 29. Beginning in March, the year ran as follows: 31 30 31 30 31 30 31 30 31 30 31 29. The Roman Senate called the 7th month—or rather the 5th in those days—after Caesar himself (July) and it had 31 days.

That was all right, but his successor Augustus found that the next month, which was duly named after him, had only 30 days. So he stole another day from poor February, and this necessitated (since apparently you could not have three months with 31 days in a row) taking a day each from September and November and adding them to October and December. So you get our present irregular sequence of 31 28 31 30 31 30 31 31 30 31 30 31.

The first year of this new calendar came to be called the Year of Confusion because it actually had 455 days—so erratic had the priestly mathematics become. But it was the first coherent calendar in the Western world. It is of a piece with the rest of the Romans' rough and ready, but intensely practical, civilization. Before them the calendar had always been a purely priestly affair, a matter of mystery and astronomical figures, religiously hidden from the people. In any of the previous civilizations, in Egypt or Assyria or Greece, men posted on towers watched for the thin silver of the new moon. When it appeared trumpets were blown and the priests marched out of the temple proclaiming the sacrifice or the feast—calling the people to worship just as the Muezzin today announces the beginning of Ramadan, the Mohammedan month of fasting.

The Egyptians were the most accomplished astronomers of the world in Caesar's time, and he called for the help of Sosigenes of Alexandria in ordering his reforms.

Sosigenes, however, overestimated the bissextile requirements of the solar cycle—I mean he overdid the leap year business—because he arranged a leap year every 4 years, which was too many by 1 day in 130 years. Consequently by Pope Gregory's time (1570 onwards), the calendar clock was 10 days fast. A series of Church Councils had noticed precipitancy for 150 years before. The Council of Constance in 1414, the Council of Basel in 1431 both pressed their Popes to correct the inaccuracy, but at those moments the Popes were too preoccupied with the Renaissance to bother about it. The Lateran Council in 1512 and Trent, in its last session in 1563, spoke about it even more forcibly—but by then the Popes were preoccupied with Luther and the Counter-Reformation. However, Gregory courageously took the matter in hand.

In the front of your Prayer Books you will see the main part of his work, in those elaborate tables of Golden Numbers and Epacts and Cycles, by which you find the date of Easter during the sermon. One of the things we are proposing is to fix the date of Easter, on an ordinary sensible laymen's date. What the present system, Gregory's system, amounts to is that the Church has created an imaginary Moon, a luminary known as the Paschal Moon, which rotates hypothetically throughout the year, occasionally being hustled on so as to coincide roughly with the visible gyrations of the real moon. And Easter is the Sunday that follows its first Full after March 21 —which may be anything from March 22nd to April 25th.

Gregory also corrected the leap year system to our present method of every four years except for centuries unless the first two figures of the century are divisible by four (thus, 1900 wasn't, but 2000 will be). He fixed the beginning of the year at January 1 instead of in March, and in order to get the clock back to the right time he ordained that October 15 should follow October 4 that year.

All the Catholic nations adopted his reforms at once, but the Protestant and non-Catholic nations hung back. Especially Russia, Sweden and England, which were still using what was called the Old Style in the 18th century.

England in the days of Elizabeth was not likely to pay much attention to social reforms from abroad; but it was the growing conservative insularity of the 16th and 17th centuries rather than religious objections that made us refuse the reforms of 150 years. But in the 18th century Europe was united as it had not been since the great days of the Papacy and as it has never been again. The statesmen had invented the Balance of Power, the Benevolent Despots copied each other from the Tagus to the Vistula; a veneer of culture—of politesse and wit—spread all over Europe, and the aristocrats of the intelligence travelled from one end of the continent to the other.

In such an age of snobbishness it was only appropriate that the British calendar should be reformed by the greatest snob of them all. Lord Chesterfield—whose letters to his son you have probably read—was the most polished gentleman in England. About the time that Clive returned in triumph from his extempore conquests in India, Chesterfield retired from active politics and devoted his last years to educating "Mr. Stanhope." During his brief term as Ambassador at The Hague, he had noticed how inconvenient it was that his Government should use a different calendar from the rest of Europe, and when he came home he took expert advice and decided to introduce a Bill in Parliament to establish the New Style (the Gregorian reforms) in England.

When he broached his intention to the Duke of Newcastle (who was

Secretary of State) the latter was horrified, and "he besought me to abandon it, saying he was alarmed at so bold an undertaking, and enjoined me not to stir matters that had long been quiet." But Henry Pelham, the Prime Minister, and the Lord Chancellor, Lord Hardwick, were in favor of it. Lord Chesterfield prepared the public mind by contributing essays to various periodicals, and the Bill was drawn up. The story of the famous speech with which he introduced it to parliament is best told in his own words, in a letter to his son on March 18th, 1754. (The speech itself is not extant.)

I acquainted you in a former letter that I had brought a Bill in to the House of Lords, for correcting and reforming our present calendar, which is the Julian, and for adopting the Gregorian. I will now give you a more particular account of that affair, upon which reflections will naturally occur to you that I hope may be useful, and which I fear you have not made.

It was notorious that the Julian calendar was erroneous, and had overcharged the solar year with eleven days. Pope Gregory XIII corrected this error; his reformed calendar was immediately received by all the Catholic Powers of Europe, and afterwards adopted by all the Protestant ones except Russia, Sweden and England. It was not, in my opinion, very honourable for England to remain in a gross and avowed error, especially in such company; the inconvenience of it was likewise felt by all those who had foreign correspondences, whether political or mercantile. I had determined therefore, to attempt the reformation; I consulted the best lawyers and the most skillful astronomers, and we cooked up a Bill for that purpose.

But then my difficulty began; I was to bring in this Bill, which was necessarily composed of law jargon and astronomical calculations, to both of which I am an utter stranger. However, it was absolutely necessary to make the House of Lords think that I knew something of the matter, and also to make them believe that they knew something of it themselves, which they do not. For my own part, I could just as soon have talked Celtic or Sclavonian to them as astronomy, and they would have understood me full as well; so I resolved to do better than to speak to the purpose, and to please instead of informing them. I gave them, therefore, only an historical account of calendars, from the Egyptian down to the Gregorian, amusing them now and then with little episodes; but I was particularly attentive to the choice of my words, to the harmony and roundness of my periods, to my elocution, to my action.

This succeeded and ever will succeed; they thought me informed because I pleased them, and many of them said that I had made the whole very clear to them, when, God knows, I had not even attempted it. Lord Macclesfield, who had the greatest share in forming the Bill, and who is one of the greatest mathematicians and astronomers in Europe, spoke afterwards with infinite knowledge and all the clearness that so intricate matter would admit of; but as his words, his periods and his utterance were not so good as mine, preference was unanimously, though most unjustly, given to me.

After sundry amendments by the House of Commons, the Bill was read a third time on May 17th and received the Royal Assent on May 22nd, 1751. It was called: "An Act for regulating the Commencement of the Year and for correcting the Calendar now in use." Its preamble began: "Whereas the legal supputation of the year of Our Lord in that part of Great Britain called England according to which the year beginneth on the 25th day of March, hath been found by experience to be attended with divers inconveniences."

It enacted that September 14 should follow September 2nd and that

the year should officially begin—as popularly it had long begun—on January 1. Lord Chesterfield afterwards belittled his action in the eyes of the world, though actually it was a fine performance. In a letter to a French lady, the Marquise de Monconseil, in April 1751, he gives a most amusing account of how he came to do it.

(After saying that she often had cause to reproach him with his failure to write to her, he goes on, in French:)

I will forestall you this time by giving you an account of what has been hindering me. Having nothing more to do with mundane affairs, I have been amusing myself with heavenly things. I have become so familiar with the planets that, if you liked, I could give you a new volume of the *Pluralite des Mondes*. Don't think that I prefer this affair with the planets to our relations; far from it. In fact, my purpose in it all was to establish your style in this country by Act of Parliament. I had noticed for a long time past that you dated your letters eleven days ahead of our time, and that I got them here on a day before you had sent them. I was sure that you must be right. I mentioned the matter to some astronomers who said, Yes, you were; and that if I appealed to the sun or the moon, they would support you.

They told me that a Pope had had your idea about 200 years ago, and had introduced what one calls the New Style. As a good Protestant I did not want to have anything to do with a Pope, but I did want to introduce your style—which is quite the best I know. But in order to satisfy the public, who haven't the honour of knowing you as I do, I had to give it astronomical explanations. Thus I became an astronomer, and it is highly diverting to hear me talk about Tropical Years, Luni-solar cycles, Intercalations, etc. But the long and the short of it is, your style is established in this country. So you see how seldom the public really knows the inner history of things—for it hasn't the least idea that you have had anything to do with this affair.

The polite society of England readily accepted a reform introduced under such auspices, but the people were shocked. They thought their lives were being shortened by Act of Parliament, and intermittently for several weeks mobs stamped up and down Whitehall shouting "Give us back our eleven days!" They didn't get over it very quickly either, for two years later at an election in Oxfordshire, where the son of one of the astronomers was standing, the crowd revived the cry. Hogarth, in a series of satirical pictures of election methods, done at the time of this election, has a drunken election tout sitting on the ground while a butcher pours gin into a wound on his scalp, and by his side is a broken banner with the legend "Give us our eleven days." I hope the England of today is sufficiently enlightened so that there will be no danger of a mob in Whitehall next time the calendar is reformed—which may be at any moment.

Nowadays it is unthinkable that any nation should be 150 years late, but in the matter of the Gregorian reforms, some were even later than that. Bulgaria only adopted them in 1915, and Turkey and Russia in 1917, Yugoslavia and Rumania in 1919, and Greece in 1923—nearly 350 years late. Even Japan adopted the Western style in 1872 and China in 1912. So there is very little of the world left now that doesn't use Caesar's calendar. Of course cannibals don't and jungle-hunting pygmies and such-like primitive peoples. The Mohammedan world — Arabia,

Asia Minor, half of India—uses a purely lunar calendar, with very complicated religious intercalations, and Lo the poor Indian uses about 16 different other kinds of time, and the Coptic Church in Egypt and Abyssinia has its own calendar—which includes a delightful month called Toot!

But to get on with our discussion. Modern commerce and industry are so international and coordination is so essential—industry and finance are so highly organized and scientific—that even a calendar reformed as recently as 350 years ago is not good enough! The movement for reform now is thoroughly international. A recent conference of the League of Nations on Calendar Reform was attended by delegates of 44 nations, as well as by representatives of the Churches and national committees. And really the only obstacle to immediate reform is the campaign waged by certain enthusiasts who think it will be a good idea to have 13 months instead of 12. Which is such a fantastic and unnecessary idea that, in England at least, a great many people have been prejudiced against the whole question by it. It must be emphasized that all the necessary benefits can be achieved without any violent innovations.

However, let me explain what's wrong with our 2,000 year old—our well-crusted, dyed-in-the-wool, fine old Tory calendar. It's not the months that cause the trouble but the weeks. You have two sets of time, two time series, running concurrently throughout the year. Very seldom, with the present system, do they synchronize—the months seldom begin with the first day of a week (in 1933 only two of the months began with a Sunday). Since one of the time sets is composed of a series of sevens, and seven will not divide exactly into 365, and since the other has 12 groups and 12 will not divide exactly into 365, you are bound to have days over from each series at the end of the year.

So obviously the thing to do is to take this one day over from each time series and synchronize them so that you just have one odd day, and then remove it outside both the series, making it an extra day not in any month or week—just a day by itself, called Year End Day, falling between the end of December and the first of January.

The proposed method of reform would make very little difference to you if it was introduced next year. March 31, May 31 and August 31, would disappear, and their places would be taken by April 31 and by the 29th and 30th of February. Instead of saying laboriously "Thirty days hath September, April, June and November," every time you want to know how many days hath August, and instead of having to borrow a diary or find the day's paper whenever you want to know the date, and then counting on your fingers backwards and forwards to find out the date of the Thursday after next or what day of the week the 15th of June was—why you will have to do none of that, for you will have learned the calendar in your cradles, far more easily than the multiplication table.

# FROM A RAILROAD VIEWPOINT

*By* A. J. Hills

*Canadian National Railways, Montreal*

WHEN anyone advocates the virtual scrapping of the present-day calendar and the adoption of a 13-month year, that goes somewhat beyond reform and approaches revolution. Such a measure seems to be entirely unnecessary. Calendar adjustment to meet the requirements of our times appears a very simple matter, the great objective being to prevent the shifting of the days from year to year.

If at the end of last year, 1933, we had agreed that December 31 was not to be Sunday but an extra day known as "Year-End Day," and then had commenced 1934 with Sunday, January 1, we could have used the 1933 calendars for 1934; and if we did the same thing every year we would never have to change the calendar (provided that when Leap Year came around we used the same procedure with Leap Day, inserting it for convenience at the end of the first half year instead of at the end of February).

However, as this procedure requires international legislation, we may as well also equalize the quarters and smooth out the kinks put into the calendar by the Caesars. The whole thing can be done by adding two days to February, one to April, and taking one day each from March, May and August.

The calendar which this would produce would have three kinds of months: *A months,* January, April, July and October, each commencing on Sunday and ending on Tuesday, containing 31 days each; each with five Sundays; each commencing a quarter of the year. *B Months,* February, May, August and November, each commencing on Wednesday and ending on Thursday, containing 30 days each with four Sundays. *C Months,* March, June, September and December, each commencing on Friday and ending on Saturday, containing 30 days each with four Sundays; each ending a quarter year and each having five Saturdays.

Each month would have 26 weekdays. Each quarter would have 91 days, whereas now the quarters have 90, 91, 92 and 92 days respectively.

At the end of every year the "supplementary day" comes in after Saturday, December 30, which might be called "Year Day" or "Year-End Day." It can be called anything you like, so long as it is not given a weekday designation. It is required in the new calendar because the year is one day (and a bit) longer than 52 weeks (364 days), and therefore one must keep one day per annum out of the weekday sequence.

Expressed in another way, the trouble with the present calendar lies

in the fact that 365 cannot be divided evenly by seven. There is a day left over. A day and a fraction—the fraction being taken care of by putting in an extra day in leap years.

Such a calendar has many advantages over the present calendar, but the principal advantage is the fixation of all the dates in the year to definite weekdays.

Those who advocate the 13-month calendar claim for it many advantages, but it also has many disadvantages. And it may be discarded as impractical, because it is not within range of adoption. Whereas the so-called World Calendar involves only the few changes outlined above, having every worth-while advantage of any other plan with no disadvantages as compared to the present calendar.

Certain special advantages claimed for the 13-month calendar are found on study to be present also in The World Calendar. For instance, the arrangement of The World Calendar would permit the easy and convenient compilation of weekly statistics in four-week periods, as desired by a number of concerns to whom the week is of particular importance.

Having taken up the subject thus far in a general way, I desire now to apply calendar reform specifically to the affairs and accountings of the railroads.

In the railway business there is little occasion to compare one week with the preceding or succeeding week. Whether a 13-month or a 12-month revision of the calendar is adopted, the comparison which is most frequently used is between a given period in the present year and the same period in previous years. Under The World Calendar, this comparison would be stabilized, facilitated and made accurate.

I turn now to certain specific railway problems. The railway year, for the sole purpose of reporting earnings, has 48 weeks: the first three weeks of each month are 7-day periods, the last period of each month includes all days beyond the 21st. In The World Calendar the fourth periods would all have 8 weekdays or working days. It is true that there would be a variation in the Sundays and the make-up of the 8 working days. But the variation would not be as great as under the present calendar, nor would it be as great as could be experienced under the 13-month calendar when holidays came in the month.

Mr. Cotsworth of the International Fixed Calendar League gives each day of the week an earning-power value in relationship to other days. With an entire week rated at 100, he gives the days the following values: Sunday 6 per cent, Monday 15, Tuesday 16, Wednesday 17, Thursday 18, Friday 17, Saturday 11. Assuming that these earning values are correct, the variations caused by the differing constitution of the fourth reporting periods (under The World Calendar) would be as follows:

In the *A months* the fourth period would have a full week's value of

100 plus Sunday, Monday and Tuesday, or 37, making 137; and with the first three weeks at 100 each the month would total 437. In the *B Months* the fourth period would have a full week's value of 100 plus Wednesday and Thursday, or 35, making 135; giving the full month a value of 435. In the *C Months* the fourth period would have a full week's value of 100 plus Friday and Saturday, or 28, giving the full month a value of 428.

Each quarter would total 1300, and the four quarters would total 5200, or 52 one hundred per cent weeks.

This is the limit of fourth-period variation under The World Calendar. The variation between 128 and 137 is seven per cent.

Under the present calendar each month of the year provides a separate or distinct quota of the year's business. It is not expected that January's revenues should be equal to February's. Even if January had four 7-day weeks as February has (as the 13-month plan proposes), the month of January would still be affected by the conditions which affect the first month of the year as against the second.

Similarly, July and August are individual months; July has a national holiday, and August has local or civic holidays. July with a fixed holiday will run truer to form than with the first day of July (or the fourth of July in the United States) coming on any day in the week, but the comparison of railway earnings that is important, is not, as stated, as between the months of one year, but as compared with the same month of the previous or of other years.

Each week or period of each month is known to have a different quota of earnings; this would not be changed by making the months equal in number of working days or by making them identical as regards starting and ending days. Smoothing out the kinks in the calendar in so far as length of months is concerned will not remove seasonal changes. The last period of December as regards railway earnings will always be quite different from the first period of January, whether or not the periods are of the same length or makeup.

Those who watch railway earnings know that apart from the length of the period, the position of the period in the month affects the revenues. On the other hand, there is no doubt that variations in the fourth period are much affected by the variations in the consist of the two or three days which are thrown into the last period, that is over and above the days from the 22nd to the 28th, but if these days for each month as compared with the same month in other years were the same, a value could and would be set up for them and the variation due to special conditions could be easily determined. In other words, a fixed Calendar is all that is required, not necessarily one of equal months, because irrespective of length, other conditions will affect the standing of the day, week or month.

It is probably true that if a 13-month calendar were in effect, and

provided that all employees were paid on a weekly basis, there would be more regularity in retail purchases, but a great many employees are paid by the month or twice a month, and there is no reason to suppose that the weekly payment plan would be generally adopted for those paid on other bases, unless to get away from the awkwardness of paying thirteen times a year one-thirteenth of an employee's yearly compensation.

Let us assume the 13-month calendar to be in effect—what about the first week in the year? According to Mr. Cotsworth the value of a Monday, which would be observed as New Year's Day, is ordinarily 15 per cent of the week's earnings. This will probably fall to a Sunday value of six per cent so that as a week, the first week of the year drops from 100 per cent to 92 per cent.

In February along comes Washington's birthday on February 22, which, being Sunday, would be observed on Monday the 23rd, when the week would be similarly affected to the first week in January.

Then comes Good Friday on April 6 (if Easter be fixed for April 8), affecting its week, and Easter Monday affecting the following week, though probably not so materially.

In Canada and other British countries, Empire Day is celebrated on May 24, formerly the Queen's (Victoria) birthday. This comes on a Tuesday under the 13-month plan, which would be unsatisfactory, and it would no doubt be observed on Monday, the 23rd. Under The World Calendar this day would fall on a Friday and make a fine long weekend.

The 13-month plan by the introduction of the new month Sol after June would push back the dates of the United States' and Canada's national birthdays, making them the 196th and 200th days of the year instead of the 182nd and 185th, a variation of two weeks, which is considerable.

The first of July in the 13-month calendar would be a Sunday and the holiday would be observed on Monday. The fourth would be a Wednesday, but in any case the value of the week would be affected.

Labor Day would be Monday, September 2, but would be the 254th day in the year instead of the 245th. Thanksgiving Day (Canadian) would affect October and Armistice Day November, and Christmas in December, with Year-End Day thrown in, would considerably affect the last week of the year.

Therefore, notwithstanding all the changes which a 13-month year would involve, it would be found that holidays would muss up the weeks and months so that the regularity desired and so much stressed would not actually result.

It is more or less obvious that absolute regularity cannot be obtained by the 13-month plan. On the other hand, the fixed nature of the Calendar has much to commend it, but the advantage can be obtained by The

World Calendar, with a minimum of disturbance or upheaval of any kind.

Under both plans year days and leap-year days are intercalated. The only things that the 13-month calendar does that The World Calendar does not do, is to start and end each month on the same day of the week and to provide months of precisely equal length. In view of the variations in the months which holidays make, the equal length of months seems relatively unimportant. And as the starting day of each month under The World Calendar will be fixed and not vary from year to year, the main part of the objection raised against the present calendar, which comes from this defect or the variation from year to year in the beginning and ending of the month, is removed.

The worst thing that happens under the present calendar is the shifting of the days due to the year being one day longer than 52 weeks, and this odd day being treated as an ordinary day. When a month ends, for instance, on a Saturday, as January did in 1931, and ends on a Sunday as would follow in 1932, the reported earnings are bound to be affected. Using the daily values recognized by Mr. Cotsworth, the days beyond the 28th have a normal value of 46 per cent of a week in 1931, and but 34 per cent in 1932, but the actual variation might be considerably greater by the fact that all the earnings of Saturday would not come into the reports.

When the extra day is kept out of the week by being added as an extra or repeating Saturday, the New Year starts on the same day every year, and while it seems desirable also to straighten out the kinks put into the calendar by the Caesars, that is relatively unimportant as compared with the fixing of dates to definite assignments, every year without change.

Mr. Cotsworth, in one of his pamphlets, lists nine "special advantages which he feels railways would get from the adoption of the 13-month calendar. But all of them apply equally to The World Calendar—which at the same time would avoid all disadvantages of more radical revision.

The changes involved in the 13-month scheme seem too drastic to endorse and of very doubtful value, particularly when it is appreciated that the fixing under The World Calendar will take care of the shifting days and thus greatly facilitate accounting by weeks for those businesses which are best watched by weekly periods.

As far as railway returns and statistics go, it is my opinion that a fixed month would be an adequate yardstick, and that the advantages of maintaining established monthly and half-year periods for bygone comparisons, even though slightly varying from those of the past, would outweigh any advantages put forward by those who advocate the 13-month calendar, which are based on the equality in length of the months and their uniformity as regards commencing and ending days, as these features—of questionable value—are the only ones not met by The World Calendar, which has many advantages not obtainable with 13 months.

# REVISING CHURCH CALENDARS

*By* The Reverend Edward S. Schwegler, D.D.

*Assistant Pastor, Church of St. John the Evangelist (Roman Catholic), Buffalo, N. Y.*

(From *Orate Fratres*, a Liturgical Review, St. Paul, Minn.)

THE present article is an attempt to bring before an audience of persons especially devoted to the liturgy of the Catholic Church a question in which they should be highly interested and concerning which they should have the latest information.

The reform of the calendar has been agitated for many years. In this particular place, however, we shall be concerned neither with the history of the subject, nor with the general advantages of calendar reform, nor with the official stand of the Church on the matter: all of which points the present writer has covered at some length in other publications. We shall consider here only the strictly liturgical aspect of our question, in the hope that such consideration may arouse reflection, and possibly comment, on the part of those who are most familiar with the liturgy and best fitted to pass judgment on matters liturgical.

But first for a brief resumé of the current proposals. There are two of these, finally selected by the League of Nations as being the most feasible out of all those proposed throughout the world. The first is the 13-month plan. The second is the 12-month equal quarters plan.

Each of these schemes posits a so-called "supplementary," or extra-calendrical day in order to obtain the great desideration of permanence. This extra day is called by neither a week day nor a Sunday name, and is considered, for calendrical purposes, to be outside of the calendar entirely. It is used once in ordinary years (365 days) and twice in leap years (366 days). By means of this very simple artifice each year counts always three hundred sixty-four days (28 x 13, or 91 x 4).

Both of the schemes under discussion also demand a fixed Easter: April 15 in the 13-month calendar, April 8 in The World Calendar.

But what is wrong with our present calendar, the so-called Gregorian, that it should be in need of "reform"? It was good enough for our fathers and grandfathers to the nth generation: why not good enough for us?

Speaking again only from the liturgical standpoint, one may summarize the faults of the present calendar as follows. (1) Saints' days and feasts of definite date are not stable, but may fall on any day of the week. This makes it impossible to remember the liturgical calendar exactly from year to year with regard to these feasts. (2) Easter may occur anywhere between March 22 and April 25—a period of 35 days. Ascension, Pentecost, Trinity, the Sundays after Pentecost—in a word, all the feasts reckoned

from Easter—may vary in date by a similar number of days. The result is that one can never tell from year to year when Easter and all its dependent festivals will occur. (3) The combination of the two foregoing difficulties results in a third, most provoking of all. There are constant coincidences, or collisions, so to speak, of dated feasts with festivals regulated by Easter. In order to establish regularity in the resultant confusion, intricate rules are drawn up for every contingency. For instance, one should know what Offices are preferred to others; what Offices are transferred to other days; to what day they are transferred; what Offices are only commemorated; what Offices are omitted. One has to take into account such things as major Sundays of the first class, major privileged ferials, privileged octaves, privileged vigils, primary doubles of the first class, major non-privileged ferials, privileged octaves of the third order, and a number of other terms and facts which only a born liturgiologist could understand.

The practical solution of all these difficulties is that an *Ordo,* or "directory," indicating the Office and Mass from day to day, is published every year; and the priest consults this official program whenever he says his Office or celebrates holy Mass. And since the layman, usually, cannot make head or tail of the Latin *Ordo,* we find it necessary to publish the *Ordo* in English for the laity, or scatter a Leaflet Missal for Sunday after Sunday.

Such, then, are the general disadvantages of the present calendar. We shall consider them more in detail shortly.

Now, to remedy these defects, it is proposed to stabilize the calendar as above indicated. What about these plans?

The 13-month calendar, from a liturgical standpoint, has many difficulties. The number twelve is so traditionally bound up with the Church's calendar that it is hard to see how the Church could ever agree to its abandonment. Occasionally the number itself, or a subdivision of it, has liturgical significance: as, for example, in the case of the Annunciation, March 25, which is exactly nine months from the feast of the Nativity, and thereby represents quite literally and evidently the period which the Savior spent in His Blessed Mother's womb. By the 13-month calendar the Annunciation would be March 28 and Christmas December 23, and the exact correspondence of the two periods would be destroyed.

The above facts foreshadow another grave difficulty of the 13-month calendar. Dates that have been venerable for centuries would have to be changed. The Annunciation and Christmas have just been mentioned. One would have, besides, such strange things as these: Candlemas, February 5; St. Patrick, March 20; St. Mark (Rogation Day), May 3; Nativity of St. John, Sol 7 (!); the Visitation, Sol 15 (!!); the Assumption, August 3; All Souls, October 25; the Immaculate Conception, December 6. The picture presented by so many outlandish dates is rather revolutionary, to

say the least. . . . Here is another point. The 13-month calendar places Easter on April 15. This brings Good Friday on Friday, April 13. The perpetual conjunction of the most felicitous event in the Church calendar with Friday 13, however irrational the superstition connected with that day may be, would be unfortunate.

But such a circumstance is incidental. It is the too violent departure from all tradition that condemns the 13-month scheme on liturgical grounds. The twelve months in the year and the familiar dates of the ecclesiastical calendar are too deeply rooted in the historical background of the Church to be thus easily relinquished.

True, if there were no alternative, one might possibly be justified in advocating the abandonment of tradition altogether, provided such abandonment were compensated for by sufficient advantages and no other grave difficulties were involved. But here exactly is the weakest spot in the armor of the 13-month proposal. Its great antagonist, the 12-month equal-quarters plan, not only offers stabilization and regularity, but also has the weighty advantage of departing as little as possible from the old, traditional arrangement.

By the 12-month scheme, two days are added to February and one to April, whilst a day is taken from March, May and August. The other months remain as they are now. The result is four quarters of three months each in the constant proportion of thirty-one, thirty, thirty days. With the aid of the supplementary days as explained above, this revised calendar assumes permanence. Given days always fall on the same dates, and given dates always occur on the same days of the week.

In addition to this, The World Calendar places Easter on April 8. Concerning the historical fitness of this date we are not here concerned: we shall use the date simply as a working hypothesis.

Now, it is quite astounding what advantages of symmetry and regularity these comparatively few changes accomplish. The Church year would always begin on December 3, the first Sunday of Advent; and Pentecost Sunday would always occur on May 26. There would always be four Sundays after Epiphany, instead of the two to six now possible; and always 26 Sundays after Pentecost.

With this new arrangement we could always know on what day of the week and what date of the month great Church festivals fell. Christmas would always come on Monday and the Circumcision on Sunday. The dates would be the old traditional ones familiar to everybody. Ascension would of course still be on Thursday; its constant date would be May 16—the middle Thursday in May. The Assumption and All Saints would fall on Wednesday, the Immaculate Conception on Friday. The dates would again be the old familiar ones: August 15, November 1, December 8.

Year Day, and, in leap years, Leap Day, might become holy days of obli-

gation. The Church could perhaps appoint new Offices for these days: perhaps one stressing the idea of universal peace, and another to honor Christ the Worker. Or possibly, on Year Day the Office for the Sunday within the octave of Christmas might be utilized.

There would be a whole day of quiet before the two great festivals of Christmas and New Year's. From the standpoint of liturgical appreciation this would be a decided advantage: minds and bodies would be rested, and the faithful would be in better condition to realize the full religious significance of these festivals.

Other particular details the reader can easily figure out for himself. Let us meanwhile consider a more general point, which has already been touched upon in the foregoing.

The Liturgical Movement has as one of its principal aims the active participation of the faithful in the public worship of the Church, particularly in holy Mass, and this is best accomplished by their intelligent use of the Missal. But what do they find when they begin to study the Missal? A continual change of feasts and Offices from year to year: omissions here, commemorations there, transferences in another place—all of which becomes very confusing. And they discover, if they consult their parish priest, that even he cannot remember all the changes that occur, and is forced to use his *Ordo* in order to follow the Church's calendar properly.

Confronted with such facts, the poor liturgically-minded layman throws up his hands in despair: the *Ordo* is in Latin, and has so many abbreviations that it looks like a Chinese puzzle. Perhaps he reflects with more understanding upon something he once read: that a doctor's prescription and a priest's *Ordo* are two things no layman may ever hope to understand this side of paradise.

However, our seeker after liturgical beauty, after almost giving up his ambitions to understand the Mass thoroughly, suddenly finds that a sort of *Ordo* is printed in English for his especial benefit; and he quickly buyeth thereof, and goeth his way rejoicing. Or he hears of a Leaflet Missal published for every Sunday—and he buyeth thereof also, and goeth his way doubly rejoicing.

That is, he buys if he has enough sustained interest in the liturgy, and enough spare change. But even then, he finds it rather cumbersome and provoking to be forced to carry the *Ordo* along with his pocket Missal and constantly consult it. And as for the general principles that underlie the thing, he finds himself as much in the dark as ever. For the Leaflet Missal he is duly grateful; but this, too, he finds to be a cumbersome makeshift, useful only on Sunday; and the yearly expense, be it ever so small, may be a source of constant annoyance.

Wouldn't it be glorious to put all these clumsy appurtenances on the shelf and have a Missal in which everything would be the same year after

year for a given date? In which the *Proprium de Tempore* (feasts that vary in date) and the *Proprium de Sanctis* (feasts of fixed date) would be conjoined and unified? In which it would only be necessary to turn to two parts of the book in order to follow the Mass—the Canon and the Proper of the day? For which no *Ordo* would be necessary from one end of the year to the other?

All this would give such a *coup de grâce* to the difficulties of the liturgically minded as it is hardly possible to hope for.

Now, of course, one may object to the proposal of a stabilized calendar on the grounds that our present arrangement has variety, and thereby adds the proverbial spice to ecclesiastical life. That there is variety at present one cannot deny; but the variety is of the kind that is more apt to cause profanity than to inspire a *Te Deum* in some circles. After all, the calendar is a means of measurement—it is the yardstick of time. All units of measurement are absolute and fixed: length, area, contents of one kind or another. Why should this unit of time alone vary from year to year? But let us look into this matter of liturgical variety a little more closely.

The variety may consist in a feast falling on different days. For example, in 1932 the Circumcision fell on a Friday; in 1933 on a Sunday. But liturgically the Office and Mass were quite the same in both years. So here the variety was nil, except with regard to the purely mechanical change of day.

Another instance: in 1932 January 3 was the feast of the Holy Name, with a commemoration of the octave of St. John. In 1933 January 3 was the octave of St. John, with no commemoration. But what does this mean as regards variety? By the time January 3, 1933 arrived, one forgot what took place January 3, 1932. Variety is pleasing and significant only if one is conscious of the existing contrast.

Further, that a feast is this year celebrated with its entire Office and next year is celebrated only by being commemorated in another Office is not a matter of especial variety either. The Office of the feast remains the same, and is recalled by its commemoration; and the commemoration itself merely consists of certain prayers taken from the Office. Once more, the variety is simply a mechanical detail and one that a person would not remember from one year to the next.

"But," says some one, "more feasts and saints have their Offices said in full at least in some years by the present arrangement than would be true in a fixed calendar. And this makes for greater variety and greater devotion."

By way of example, our objector might adduce, let us say, the feast of St. Valentine. In the present year that saint got only a commemoration, since his feast coincided with Ash Wednesday; but in 1933 he had the whole day's Office to himself. And people interested—lovers, supposedly,

in this instance—might insist that at least occasionally their patron saint should have a day to himself.

Very well. But one may deny from the very outset that this argument can be reduced to a matter of variety. After all, it is only the minor feasts that get deprived of a full Office very often: and it is just these feasts that lack variety in their Offices. The more important a feast becomes, the more likelihood, generally speaking, will there be of its having an Office of its own. But as a feast decreases in importance it will have a growing tendency to borrow its Office from another day or from some general Office covering the class of feasts to which it belongs. So, for instance, this very feast of St. Valentine has only one lesson and an oration proper to itself; the rest of it is taken from the general Office known as the "Common of One Martyr." And the Mass for St. Valentine is taken wholly, with the exception of the orations, from the "Common" Mass *Pro Martyre non Pontifice* which is known by its introductory words *In Virtute*. Now, that same "Common" Office and that same "Common" Mass do service in the course of the year for a lot of other minor martyrs who have not a proper Office; and the repetition of such Offices makes for monotony, not for variety. Variety in the Church calendar consists in a difference not so much between the same day in various years as between successive days, or days fairly close together, in the same year. Produce a schedule that is quite varied through 365 days and you have a calendar with variety, even though that identical calendar be repeated year after year. And any one denying this must perforce criticize our present calendar on the very grounds upon which he is defending it: for, after all, even in the present arrangement most days of the calendar, liturgically speaking, remain practically the same year after year.

It may also be pointed out that when an Office appears in full in a certain year, some other Office has suffered by being only commemorated, due to coincidence with some more important feast. So the very thing which is supposed to be an advantage in the present calendar produces the precise disadvantage it is supposed to eliminate, and therefore neutralizes itself.

Besides the feasts of saints said from the "Common" there is another type of Office and Mass that may at times become quite monotonous: the ferial Office and Mass "of the day"—*de ea*. We shall limit our consideration of these to the Mass.

At one, and only one, season of the year is the ferial Mass proper and does it vary from day to day—and it is, therefore, attractive because of its appropriateness and variety. That one and only season of the year is Lent. At all other times the Mass of the day is a complete repetition of the Sunday Mass, with one or the other additional oration. The same is true of the Masses in certain octaves: *v.g.*, the Immaculate Conception: when the Office of the octave is said, the corresponding Mass is the same as the Mass

of the feast. It is such repetitions that make for monotony, and not variety, in the present calendar.

Just by way of statistics: there are in the calendar of the present year at least 75 days on which the Mass is identical with the Mass of a Sunday or of a feast that has a high ranking octave (counting in the Sundays and feasts themselves). Consider, for instance, the octave of the Epiphany. On January 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 the Mass each day was quite the same.

What is the point of all this? Well, the point is that the boasted variety of our present calendar does not eliminate the monotony that proceeds from the identity of liturgical functions and Offices on days next to, or not far removed from, each other.

Would calendar reform eliminate this monotony? It would not. It would simply, as things stand, take some particular pattern of our varying Church calendar and make it permanent, with its monotony stabilized. In other words, granting that the year began on a Sunday, that Easter fell on April 8, and that we made use of the supplementary days, all the present rules for coincidence, transference, *etc.*, of feasts would be applied in one grand, final application, and then could be relegated to the realm of historical curiosities. The result would be a petrifaction of the present rules.

However, there would always be the possibility of varying the regular ecclesiastical routine by saying votive Masses—Masses, that is, chosen in accord with the *votum* or desire of the celebrant. One may be sure that the argument for variety in the calendar would come from the priest rather than the layman: the latter would be only too delighted to have a succession of things that he could easily understand and follow. If the priest therefore found the fixed calendar too monotonous, he would always be free to say votive Masses. Indeed, the rules for the saying of these Masses might be relaxed somewhat for the benefit of such celebrants as would desire the utmost of variety in the liturgical functions.

Yet, on the other hand, some priests at least (and the liturgically-minded among the laity might well chime in with them) would rather desire a stiffening of the rules about votive Masses than otherwise. There are those who, at present, insert into the daily program of parish Masses by far more Requiem Masses—and they are votive Masses, be it remembered—than is good for an appreciation of the liturgy, clerical or lay. Why should the parish Mass morning after morning be in lugubrious black, when so many other beautiful Masses may be sung by simply following the liturgy of the day? What appreciation of the liturgy may be got by listening to the droning of the *Dies Irae* most of the time? Grief is all right in its place, but we need not always be in mourning, and the Mass of the day is just as efficacious for the departed as the *Missa de Requie*.

But that was by way of parenthesis. Let us now return to our main argument and consider one other aspect of it. . . . It must not be thought

that from the so-called variety of our present calendar only favorable, or seemingly favorable, results ensue. This very variety sometimes becomes so great as to cause notable incongruities. For instance, it can happen, under the present arrangement, that the Annunciation (March 25) falls on the third or fourth Sundays of Lent, Passion Sunday, Palm Sunday or Easter; or that the Purification (February 2) coincides with Septuagesima, Sexagesima or Quinquagesima Sundays. A liturgiologist knows what this means. All the Sundays of Lent being of the "first class," they are preferred to any other feasts whatsoever; and consequently the Annunciation, if it falls on any of them, must be transferred elsewhere. On the other hand, the three Sundays preceding Lent are of the "second class"; but the Purification is a "double of the second class," and it is only a "double of the first class" that can displace one of these Sundays. The result again is translation.

A detailed examination of the new calendar would doubtless unearth other advantages from a liturgical standpoint. Possibly also further disadvantages might be discovered. But to the present writer the advantages seem to outweigh by far the disadvantages. However, this essay is an attempt to put the whole question before liturgically-minded people, and is an appeal for expressions of opinion on the subject—especially from those

---

EDITOR'S NOTE.—After publication of this article in *Orate Fratres,* the editor received a reply from the International Fixed Calendar League, which advocates a 13-month revision of the calendar. The letter was as follows:

"Dr. Schwegler's conclusions regarding the relative changes in dates of Church festivals under the so-called Equal Quarters Plan as compared with the 13-month plan are erroneous. For example, he has listed a number of festivals whose dates would be changed under our proposal, but he fails to add that most of them would also be changed under the Equal Quarters Plan. Under the latter proposal all dates falling between February 28 and September 1 would be moved. Therefore, one plan is no more revolutionary than the other.

"Considerable discussion is given to the case of the Annunciation. By the 13-month calendar it would fall on March 23, with Christmas on December 23. By the Equal Quarters calendar it would fall on March 23 with Christmas on December 25. If, as Dr. Schwegler states, the interval between the Annunciation and the Nativity 'represents quite literally and evidently the period which the Savior spent in His Blessed Mother's womb,' then the date of the Annunciation should become March 23 under the 13-month calendar or March 18 under the Equal Quarters, since the period of development of the human embryo is 280 days or 10 months of 28 days each.

"Of the other festivals mentioned in the course of this article, the following would undergo a change in date as compared to present practice were the Equal Quarters plan adopted: Easter, Good Friday, St. Mark, Nativity of St. John, Visitation, Assumption. Out of 18 days mentioned in this article, only seven would have unchanged dates under this plan. Certainly it would appear that any plan to change the calendar must of necessity be 'revolutionary.'

"The author further seems to imply that only the Equal Quarters plan would provide an arrangement whereby 'we could always know on what day of the week and what date of the month great Church festivals fall.' This is equally true of the 13-month plan. Both proposals provide for a fixed calendar, commencing each year on Sunday and with each date perpetually falling on the same week day every year."

Dr. Schwegler's aswer to these objections was published in *Orates Fratres* concurrently with publication of the above letter. Dr. Schwegler said:

"Mr. Smith's letter is typical of a very insidious line of argumentation that will confuse people who do not thoroughly understand all the angles of calendar reform.

"When speaking of dates in this discussion we must distinguish four kinds: first, the present Gregorian date of a given festival, which we shall hereafter call its G Date; secondly, the date of the festival numerically transferred to a reformed calendar, which we shall call the R Date; thirdly, the *comparative* date in a revised calendar on which a given Gregorian date would fall, which we shall call the CR Date; and fourthly, the *comparative* Gregorian date upon which a given festival of a reformed calendar would fall, which we shall call the CG date. To illustrate: the present Gregorian date of the feast of the Nativity of St. John is June 24 (G Date). The date of that feast in the World Calendar (twelve months, equal quarters) is still June 24 (R Date). However, the *corresponding* date of this festival in The World Calendar would be June 23 (CR Date); whereas the Gregorian date corresponding to June 24 of The World Calendar would be June 25 (CG Date).

"But in the 13-month calendar June 24 (R Date) would correspond to our present June 13 (CG Date). And this brings out a fundamental difference between the two calendars. In the

who speak with authority. It is only by thorough discussion that the problem can be clarified. And it cries for clarification, one way or another.

Calendar reform is being agitated by very powerful agencies. If it can be adopted by the Church and adapted to her liturgy without essential difficulty and with many advantages both for herself and the world in general, then members of the Church should be the first to advocate it. If it offers insuperable obstacles, or should be combatted for any good reason whatsoever, then the opposition should begin now. It will be too late to offer objections if we ever come to the point where the state imposes a calendar upon everybody. Perhaps we shall never see that day. But who knows? In our own United States we have seen a lot of governmental-alphabetical organizations that, a few years ago, we should have sworn to be impossible. The same thing could conceivably happen with regard to calendar reform.

---

12-month scheme the R Date often coincides with, or differs at the most by two days from, the CG Date. Up to February 28 the dates are identical. They are also identical from September 1 to December 30. In between they differ by two days at most. Consequently, *practically all fixed feasts may in the Equal Quarters plan retain their old Gregorian dates* because the amount by which the revised dates disagree with the camparative Gregorian dates is for half the year nil, and for the rest of the year so small as to be negligible.

"But in the 13-month scheme this is not at all so. In many cases the R Date and the CG Date vary comparatively by so many days that there must be perforce a conversion of dates. This is due to the insertion of the extra month and the shortening of the months to 28 days each. Indeed, in some cases the G Date could not be numerically transferred at all, since it would land into that anomaly of anomalies, the month Sol.

"Consequently, in our example above, where June 24 (R Date) in a revised 13-month calendar would correspond to June 13 (CG Date), the difference is so great that there must be a conversion: the date in the reformed calendar corresponding to the original Gregorian date (CR Date) must be found. Accordingly, the feast of the Nativity of St. John would be, in the 13-month calendar, Sol 7 (CR Date). And it is exactly such outlandish changes that argue against the 13-month calendar from a liturgical standpoint.

"To recapitulate: we must distinguish four kinds of dates: the present Gregorian date (G Date); the same numerial date in a reformed calendar (R Date); the comparative Gregorian date of a date in a reformed calendar (CG Date); and the comparative reformed date of a present Gregorian date (CR Date). In the Equal Quarters calendar, generally speaking, one need not bother about the CG Date or the CR Date, since they are so close together as to be practically identical. In the 13-month calendar, however, the disparity between two corresponding dates is often so great that the CR Date must be newly calculated and adopted for each feast. I believe this disposes of Mr. Smith's first three paragraphs.

"In his conclusion, Mr. Smith jumbles up moveable and fixed feasts, which cannot be done in a comparison of a revised calendar with the present Gregorian. Of the fixed feasts he mentions, the CG date would not vary at all with the R Date in the Equal Quarters Calendar as regards the feast of St. Mark (October 7). In the case of the Nativity of St. John (June 24), the Assumption (August 15) and the Visitation (July 2) the variance would be one day. And this affords a very good illustration of the fact that the comparative dates of fixed feasts in the present and the Equal Quarters calendar vary by so little that our present dates could be taken over bodily with very few exceptions, thereby causing none of the truly revolutionary conversion of dates which would be typical of the 13-month calendar.

"I by no means implied in my article that 'only the Equal Quarters plan would provide an arrangement whereby we could always know on what day of the week and what day of the month great Church festivals fall.' That the 13-month plan also does this is so patently evident that the fact needs no clarification. Indeed, this detail of almost ludicrous simplicity has been one of the great arguments of the 13-month advocates. I was merely trying to emphasize that the 12-month plan gave absolute stability as well as the other, but that, in addition, it would not introduce a lot of new dates for old, familiar festivals.

"I believe my remarks up to now throw out the conclusion of Mr. Smith entirely. There remains just one point—the matter of the Annunciation. Its date under the 12-month plan would be March 25 (R Date), not March 23 (CR Date), for the reasons indicated above. Its date (CR Date) in the 13-month plan would be March 28, as Mr. Smith correctly states. For the rest of the argument: popular belief places the period of human gestation at nine *calendar* months. Nine calendar months contain, on an average, 274 days. I do not believe any medical authority will state as flatly as Mr. Smith that the period of human gestation is 280 days. Those I have consulted give anywhere from 270 to 300 days. Now: March 25 to December 25 is quite evidently nine calendar months—in the Gregorian and in the Equal Quarters calendar. But March 28 to December 23, in the 13-month calendar, is quite evidently nothing.

"I hope this elucidation will not have proved too complicated. Calendar reform is a very slippery subject, and the lubricity of the arguments brought forth by its various proponents seems occasionally designed to snare the unwary."

# PRINCIPLES OF REVISION

*By* ERLAND ECHLIN

*Secretary of the Rational Calendar Association of Canada*

(An Address before the Royal Astronomical Society of Canada, November 2, 1934.)

IN DISCUSSING the progress of calendar reform throughout the world, I would like to divide my subject into three parts: first, a brief and very general review of historical backgrounds; second, previous changes in the calendar, and third, today's reasons for reform and what has been accomplished toward the desired goal.

At the outset let me define reform as the gradual change toward simplification and greater convenience. That is all calendar revision has meant in the past or will mean in the future.

There is, I dare say, nothing in life that is more taken for granted than the calendar that stands on our desks and hangs on our walls. Wherever we go, even far from home—so long as we stay on the beaten track of travel through civilized countries—there it is, the same old calendar we have at home. As we look at its familiar face, we say complacently to ourselves: Time never changes.

Well, it may be true that *time* never changes. But man's method of reckoning time is another matter altogether. Even our familiar calendar is not quite so universal as we complacently thought it was. Because we belong to the big group of advanced nations which follow this particular system of time reckoning, we are apt to forget that there are hundreds of other nations, races, groups, or sects that still use systems different from ours. There are, not improbably, a full thousand variant methods of measuring time in the world today. We cannot contemptuously dismiss these variants with a statement that they are old-fashioned, or antiquated, or medieval: for we ourselves use a calendar that has not been changed since the end of the Middle Ages; a calendar that may quite properly be charged with being old-fashioned, antiquated and medieval.

What is the difficulty that mankind seems to have had, since time began, in devising a perfect calendar? Well, the year's length is exactly 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes and 46 1/7 seconds. That particular fact is not a recent scientific discovery: it has been generally known for 2000 years, and some ancient peoples, highly versed in scientific learning, knew it long before then. The difficult problem for the calendar-maker has always been to divide that year into days, weeks and months—into subdivisions that would be accurate, stable and convenient. It seems a simple problem, but if anyone thinks it is as simple as it sounds, let him try it. So far in the history of the world, nobody has been able to accomplish it.

Perhaps the reason for man's failure is that we are still merely human beings in the process of development, and our calendar must be an evolution, changing to meet our new needs.

Let's look back at the calendar's beginnings. In the early stage of civilization, there was little reckoning of time as we know it today. Probably the seasons were the first of all calendar divisions to register upon the human mind. Among nomadic peoples, the cool or rainy weather marked the time to begin the long trek to warmer pastures or hunting fields. Then, as primitive agriculture developed, there came a recognition of sowing time and reaping time, of dry and wet seasons. In Northern Europe the tribes divided such passage of time as they knew into Winter, Spring and Summer. Further south, where the weather was more dependable, four seasons appeared.

It was not until men began to herd together in village groups that they bothered to subdivide the seasons into moon-months or moon-weeks. Village life made men count the passage of the days, and seek to tie these days together into convenient bundles. The sun was their time-maker, and gave them nights, sunrise, sunset and a point midway between. It has often been noted, however, that primitive men rarely recorded the passage of the *days*, as such, but only the *nights*. The moon was their clock, rather than the sun. The waxing and waning of the moon, in the aspects which we call its quarters, gave them handy little periods of about seven days each, and the period from moon to moon provided longer periods by which they could count on their fingers the time between harvests. Men became aware that springs, season after season, were just so many moons apart. Out of this knowledge the "scientists" of primitive times created calendars of stone and wood, enabling their people to deal practically with the grim forces of Nature.

It was the development of this "science" that led man out of darkness into the dawn of civilization. The need for calendar knowledge forced him to study the heavens, and astronomy was born. The early astronomers were priests, magicians, mathematicians; in them was concentrated all the scientific learning that existed. Their achievements, in each developing section of the world, had more to do with the progress of the race than wars or princes.

It is probable that scientific knowledge, particularly as applied to the study of the heavens, grew up simultaneously and separately in a dozen different parts of the world. The relationship between the moon, the stars, the sun and the seasons was discovered independently by Babylonians, Egyptians, and other ancient races in Europe, Africa and Asia—perhaps also in America. More than 6,000 years ago the Egyptians were using, with considerable accuracy, a calendar of 360 days—12 months of 30 days each—to which were added an intercalary period of yearly extra days to bring the year even with the Egyptian sun.

Early Greece and Rome had less accurate calendars, modified frequently in an effort toward greater scientific accuracy. At certain times, politicians meddled with the calendar for their own selfish ends, until in the days of Julius Caesar the calendar had become an instrument of corrupt political machines, serving the needs of tax gatherers, office holders and demagogues. No groping nomad tribesman or cave-dwelling priest ever, through ignorance, confused the calendar more completely than did the Roman political wire-pullers.

Julius Caesar's reform of the calendar, then, was a move designed to clean up a political mess, rather than one dictated solely by motives of pure science. But whatever his motives, he deserves full credit for establishing under Egyptian guidance, a scientific calendar. Unfortunately, his calendar later suffered some highly unscientific alterations at the hands of his successor, Augustus.

This slightly inaccurate calendar remained unchanged for nearly 16 centuries. There has been, in fact, only one change during the Christian era. This one change, involving the correction of Caesar's leap year rule, came in 1582, when the error had grown to a difference of 10 days. Pope Gregory XIII decided to carry out the carefully-planned proposals of his physician-astronomer Ghiraldi and the mathematician Clavius, whose adjustment of centurial years reduced the error in our present calendar to one day in 3,300 years. October 5 was made October 15 in the year 1582, at least as far as Pope Gregory's power and influence extended, and a fresh start was made.

But reform met with more opposition then than it does today. The English-speaking world refused for 170 years to see the advantage of the Gregorian calendar. Some of the Balkan countries waited more than 300 years. Many followers of the Eastern Orthodox Church, in Central and Eastern Europe, still adhere to the old system.

So much for the history of the calendar. The problem up to the days of Rome was the attempt of our ancestors to reconcile three incompatibles —the seasons, the moon year and the sun year. The difficulty of today is to simplify the division of our accepted, and almost correct, year into days, weeks and months—and, when it is done, to get agreement on the solution. That is the problem of the present.

Calendar reform is as old as the first calendar. Mankind being what it is, there can be little doubt that the methods of measuring time in any given period met with objections from substantial groups of people. No sooner had tables of days been worked out in the early Mediterranean world than other Assyrians, Greeks or Egyptians set about to change, modify, improve or reform them. With scant and irregular communications between places, the different nations developed different systems, tried experiments, discarded the old and adopted the new, borrowed their neighbors' methods, or combined them strangely with their own. Startling as were some of these results among ancient nations, they were perhaps no more weird than calendar experiments which have been tried within the last century, notably by France and Russia.

Revolutions, particularly, have witnessed brief efforts at revising the calendar. It is not strange, perhaps, that every successful revolutionist feels that he is ushering in a new age—many of them, indeed, have given important emphasis to civilization's slow-turning wheel. What could be more natural, then, than that Year One of the New Era should start from the day of the uprising?

This was done in the French Revolution; it was tried again in Soviet Russia. Even National-Socialist Germany feels an urge in that direction, indicated not by any attempt to realign the nation's chronology, but by a reversion to special seasonal and nationalistic names for the months.

Of course none of these revolutionary attempts to change the calendar have succeeded, or even persisted for any considerable length of time—for the simple reason that they were not acceptable to the general public, being generally backward reforms which complicated rather than simplified.

The present demands for a revision of the calendar come from fifty different countries, and have their origins far back in the past. None of the reform proposals which are now being considered are new. Certain obvious improvements in the calendar have been consistently supported by groups of churchmen, scientists, and statesmen for centuries. The powerful influence of the church in calendar matters is indicated by the fact that the most important feature of all the current reform proposals was first advocated by a priest, the Abbe Mastrofini, about 100 years ago.

Leaders of religion, science, business, education and government are now becoming convinced that the world-changes of the past two centuries —particularly the improvements in communications, the increasing importance of international relationships, and the new efficiencies of the machine age—have at last made some change in the calendar inevitable.

This approaching change can be forecast with some accuracy. Basing our prediction on the calendar's own history, the principles of the next reform may be outlined as follows: (1) Although calendar reform has never come from the masses of the people, but always through thinkers and philosophers devoted to the advancement of life, the proposed change must be acceptable to the masses, and especially to three most important elements: the agriculturists, the workers, and the Church; (2) There must be no alteration in the number of weeks, months or seasons, and no radical departure from these time-honored subdivisions, as such a change would complicate, rather than simplify; (3) In any change, the old system must imperceptibly glide into the new.

These are the axiomatic principles of any practical plan for revision of the calendar.

We come now to the present-day facts as to the need for calendar reform. I shall not venture to give my own or any partisan views, but shall quote from the impartial League of Nations report:

> Under the present calendar the divisions of the year, the months, the quarters and the half years, are of unequal length. The months contain from 28 to 31 days. As a result the number of days in the quarters are respectively 90, 91, 92 and 92. The first half-year contains two or three days less than the second half. Months, quarters and half-years do not consist of a whole number of weeks. The weeks are usually split at the beginning and end of months, quarters, half-years and years. These unequal lengths are a cause of confusion and uncertainty in economic relations, in the arrangements of all statistics, and especially the statistics of trade.
>
> Because of these unequal periods, from days to half-years, all calculations of salaries, interest, insurance, pensions, leases and rents fixed on a monthly, quarterly or half-yearly basis are inaccurate.
>
> The calendar is not perpetual—it changes each year. Dates of periodic events can never be fixed with precision. Each year authorities have to make special decisions regarding the dates of holidays, openings of Parliament, fairs, courts, markets and assemblies. If the calendar were perpetual, the dates of these events could be fixed once for all. They would fall on the same dates as well as on the same days of the week.
>
> Finally, and this is perhaps the greatest drawback from a statistical and commercial point of view: Since the various days of the week are not of the same value

as regards the volume of trade, and the years and the months do not from year to year include the same number of weekdays, there can be no genuine statistical comparison between one year and another. The various subdivisions of the year itself—half-years, quarters and months—are likewise incapable of comparison.

Now, if the League report seems to lay undue emphasis on how business is adversely affected by the irregularities and changing features of our present calendar, no very serious objections may be raised. For whether we like it or not, we live by business, commerce and calculations. Whatever new economic and social order develops out of today's unrest, I think it can be readily seen that a simplified calendar will assist, not hinder, its growth.

As I have said, there have been many demands for reform during the past quarter century. Though the World War interfered with them, the resultant League of Nations made a focal point against which the hundreds of proposals from all parts of the world could converge. The League began its serious study of calendar reform eleven years ago, in June, 1923, the studies culminating in an international conference and report in 1931.

Out of more than 200 plans submitted, only two reached the final stage of practical consideration. These were: the 13-month scheme, and the 12-month equal-quarter plan generally known as The World Calendar. The Commission on Communications and Transit, which examined the question with the cooperation of delegates and experts from the leading countries of both eastern and western worlds, agreed that reform would be advantageous, as also would be the fixation of Easter, to which a majority of the Christian churches had even then agreed. But the Commission deferred any decisive recommendation for the actual enactment of a revision until the world-public had been more generally educated on the subject.

I am not going to give any detailed description of the 13-month proposal. Roughly, it provides for 13 months of exactly four weeks each, plus an extra intercalary day every year and two such extra days in leap years. The additional month appears between June and July, and is called Sol. The proposal is not new. The Babylonians for a time had a 13-month calendar. Three centuries before Christ an attempt was made to give a 13-month calendar to the Jews. In 1849 the French philosopher, Auguste Comte, re-introduced the scheme. In our own time, it has reappeared with the backing of the late George Eastman, on whose financial support it is still functioning, with headquarters in London.

When Eastman's plan appeared I was at once attracted to it, as were many others. It is a beautifully regular calendar and its advocates boast with pride that "it is theoretically more perfect." But it sins in one cardinal point—it is not acceptable to the people, involving a too-radical

departure from the time-honored custom of the 12-month year. At one blow it destroys the seasons, the half-year and the old months. However pleasing it may be in theory, it must stay in the realms of fancy rather than in the workaday world.

The other plan, the 12-month equal-quarter calendar, is strongest where the ingenious 13-month scheme is weak. It involves practically no disturbance of ingrained customs and habits. The appearance of the calendar is unchanged. The familiar and convenient division of the year into 12 parts is retained. The new calendar has almost perfect "balance." Each quarter is equal and comparable to every other quarter, as are the half-years and years. Every day, forever, falls on the same date. Every month has the same number of weekdays.

The transition from the present calendar to the simplified system would be so easy that it would scarcely be noticed. Yet almost every defect of our present system, as stated in the League report, is remedied. There are only seven changes of dates: two days are added to February and one to April. Compensating these, three days are taken from March, May and August. And, as in all current plans for reform, December 31 becomes a balancing or stabilizing day.

There is a maximum of benefit with a minimum of change. All religious holidays and customs are respected.

The League of Nations has stated that the chief defect of the present calendar is the imcomparability of time periods in successive years. This is remedied, in the 12-month equal-quarter plan, by a calendar which gives for all future time a practically perfect basis for statistical comparison. If it is not completely and mathematically perfect, we must blame the sun and stars and not the calendar reformers.

The next few years are certain to be critical years in the world's history. Economic changes are extremely rapid and there is a great resultant uncertainty which has brought about an emphatic demand for international economic planning and business stabilization. In these circumstances, it is essential that economists and business men—on whom we all depend—shall have all the aid possible from past records. The 12-month equal-quarter plan for calendar reform is the only proposal that does not hamper the use of these records and thereby impede national and international adjustments at a critical time in the world's history.

The almost imperceptible change from our old calendar to the new World Calendar can best take place on January 1, 1939, because the first day of the year then comes on Sunday. This is the date now proposed for adoption of the new calendar. It is four years away. The League of Nations will again discuss calendar reform in the early months of 1936. The result will probably be the drafting of international treaties for the inauguration of the new calendar in 1939.

As to the organizations which have been formed in various countries to foster and guide this movement, I need speak here only for the Rational Calendar Association of Canada, of which I have the honor to be secretary. We are a direct branch of the Rational Calendar Association of England, and maintain close relations with The World Calendar Association of New York, which has 8,500 influential members throughout the United States.

In Canada we have already enrolled members from all nine provinces, including members of Parliament, the Bench and the Bar, the faculties of universities, editors and influential business men. Affiliated with us throughout the world are similar organizations with wide memberships—in France, Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, Turkey, Germany, Greece, Denmark, Hungary, Spain and several South American countries. The movement for reform on the 12-month equal-quarter basis is gaining momentum everywhere.

In conclusion, I wish to outline some of the world forces supporting this plan of calendar revision. First, the Church.

Throughout history the Roman Catholic Church has been the great calendar reformer. The calendar has been made by Popes and revised by Popes. It would be strange indeed, therefore, if the Church did not take an important part in the present movement. The present Pope is progressive, and information which comes to me from reliable sources indicate that he is sincerely desirous of moving toward the fixation of Easter and the adoption of an improved calendar. The College of Cardinals contains many advocates of calender reform. Priests of the Catholic Church have been, for many years, prominent among the leaders of the proposed revision, and 18 of Rome's bishops and archbishops are active members of The World Calendar Association.

Representatives of the Protestant churches met a few weeks ago in Denmark, for the consideration of this subject. Delegates were present representing every important non-Roman religious body in Christendom. A resolution approving stabilization of Easter and reform of the calendar was introduced by Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, representing the American churches, and strongly supported in an address by England's famous Bishop of Chichester. The resolution, which was passed unanimously, assured the Parliaments of all nations that the churches found no dogmatic objections to calendar reform, and urged all governments to proceed at once with the necessary international legislation to put the proposed revision into effect.

At the League of Nations in 1931, only two nations officially endorsed the 13-month plan—Jugoslavia and, for some reason that no one has been able to discover, our own country, Canada. The absurd position taken by the Canadian delegate at that time, of course, makes it essential for

our Canadian Association to work even harder than its world-wide affiliates, because we must not only educate the Canadian public, but also secure from the government a withdrawal of its strange and unusual commitment.

The world movement for a 12-month equal-quarter calendar is one in which all nations ought to stand together. It is non-political, and transcends racial or nationalistic bounds. It tends toward international balance, stability and peace. Canada, once we have withdrawn our singularly inept vote of 1931, can have an important part in the adoption of this new calendar.

Fifty years ago, Standard Time was resisted as an invention of the devil. Yet it came, and when agreement was reached, almost overnight the opposition faded away and there was a universal admission of the resultant blessings of simplification.

There may develop similar fanatical objections to the present proposals for a general reform of the calendar. However, I do not anticipate any very serious opposition. The whole subject is now approaching the legislative stage. Our goal is a simplified calendar, with its undeniable blessings to the whole world, by 1939.

---

## LATIN-AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

*(From an article in the Prensa, Santiago, Chile)*

UNUSUAL distinction has been conferred upon a Chilean astronomer, Dr. Ismael Gajardo Reyes, who has been appointed a member of the International Advisory Board of the World Calendar Association, to advise the Association on matters of calendar reform in relation to all Latin-American countries. Other members of this commission include Prof. P. Stroobant, famous Belgian astronomer; Dr. Abraham Frowein of Berlin, former president of the International Chamber of Commerce; Dr. Athanase Politis, Greek diplomat and head of many important activities at the League of Nations; Prof. Amedeo Giannini, counsellor of the Italian Foreign Office.

Dr. Gajardo has undertaken to constitute permanent committees on calendar reform in each of the countries of Latin-America. These committees will contact with the League of Nations and with all the other national calendar reform committees in Europe and America.

The appointment of Dr. Gajardo comes as a result of important scientific contributions which he has made to the study of the problem of calendar reform, which is now attracting such wide attention throughout the world.

We are informed that the Minister of Foreign Relations, Mr. Miguel Cruchaga Tocornal, has given his valuable official support to the calendar reform proposals worked out by Dr. Gajardo, and has instructed the Chilean delegation at Geneva to assist in the carrying out of these proposals at the League of Nations.

Calendar reform committees thus far organized in Latin-America include the following: BRAZIL: Capt. Radler de Aquino, chmn., Jose Frazao Milanez, Dr. Sodre da Gama. CHILE: Rev. Father Valentin Panzarasa, chmn., Alberto Cumming, Santiago Lorca Pellross. BOLIVIA: Moises Santivanez, chmn., Guillermo Vidal Aramayo, Emilio Villanueva. URUGUAY: Prof. Alberto Reyes Thevenet, chmn., Fernando Fuentes, Enrique Legrand. PANAMA: Octavio Mendez Pereira, chmn., Prof. Catalino Arrocha, Ieptka B. Duncan. COSTA RICA: Teodoro Picado, chmn., Garcia Monje, Luis Doble Segreda.

# HOLIDAYS AND TRAVEL

*By* CHARLES F. WOOD

*General Manager, Clark's Cruises, Times Building, New York.*

SOME time ago, a disgruntled competitor of mine said that the travel business was no good in bad times because no one had the money to travel, and no good in good times because no one had the time to spare to travel then.

Though a reformed calendar might not be alone sufficient to relieve us of all worry on the first score, there is no doubt that it would go a long way to making things easier and more profitable for us on the second.

The constant shifting of holidays from year to year makes vacations difficult to plan ahead. If that could be corrected and the public could become accustomed to the falling of holidays on Mondays, thus making possible many long week-ends and extended vacations, holiday trips would be planned and booked well in advance and many a trip would be taken that is never and will never be taken with our present calendar system. The question "What will we do over New Year's?" would be thought of and planned well in advance, not left to the last moment with the frequent bored decision which results from last minute pressure, "Oh, let's stay at home."

As it is at present, holidays for many successive years fall on inconvenient days in the middle of the week, useless for travel purposes, and the public as a result grows unaccustomed to planning ahead. Then for two years holidays seem, unexpectedly, to work out perfectly, only to relapse into their old habits again.

It was hard luck for us and many another industry that these two good years should occur in the middle of one of the worst depressions the world has ever known.

The World Calendar calls for no radical changes in our calendar system, yet it provides all the benefits that can be claimed for any other reformed calendar proposal. It calls for the addition of no weird extra month. Six of our present months are in length unchanged: January, June, July, September, October and November. Four are decreased by one day: March, May, August and December. One day is added to April and the length of February is standardized at 30 days.

This provides us with four equal quarters, each having months of 31, 30 and 30 days and in that order. Each quarter starts on a Sunday. The second month of each quarter starts on a Wednesday, the third month on a Friday.

Each quarter has 91 days—exactly thirteen weeks. Each month has

exactly 26 week days. Four quarters, each of 91 days, make 364 days. The extra day, required to make up 365, follows the last day of December every year and is a holiday as is January 1 now. It will be known as "Year-end Day" and takes the form of an extra Saturday.

Exclusive of "Leap-year Day" and "Year-end Day", any quarter-year period, any period of three successive months, will be exactly equal and comparable. The same of course applies to any semi-annual period.

For travel purposes it is interesting to note what the effects of these changes will be on the days on which holidays will fall. "Year-end Day" will be a holiday, and will provide us each year with an excellent long week-end.

Lincoln's Birthday, February 12, will fall on a Sunday and according to custom will be celebrated on Monday. Washington's Birthday is not so fortunately situated; February 22 will be a Wednesday. Perhaps George Washington would be willing to have his birthday moved again. He has already submitted to one change, and that during his lifetime, when, because of a correction in the calendar then in use, it was changed from February 11 to the 22. By changing it back to its original date it would fall on a Saturday and, combined with the Lincoln's birthday Monday, would provide an excellent opportunity for travel on a long week-end.

Labor Day of course falls on a Monday now and will continue to do so after the adoption of The World Calendar. It will, however, be fixed on either the first or second Monday in September, the 4th or the 11th, and will cease to wander as it does now.

Christmas will fall on a Monday and will do so in perpetuity.

With Memorial Day, Columbus Day and Independence Day we are not so lucky, but after The World Calendar is adopted they also will no doubt be conveniently fixed where they will do us the most good.

I do not want it to be thought that I am attaching too much importance to the provision of long week-ends and to the travel business. But it has long been recognized that the country's, and the world's for that matter, greatest need is the stimulation of consumption. The economists have been working nights over this problem and gallons of ink have been spilled on proposals for its solution. A large part of the consumption of many commodities and services is associated with our various holidays. In our present calendar, holidays are so variable, and frequently so inconveniently placed, that they fail to provide the opportunities for recreation and the use of countless commodities and services, as well as travel, that they would under a better adjusted calendar system.

The arrangement of holidays as far as possible on Mondays would do much to stimulate consumption,—industry's present greatest need. It would make the planning of holidays customary and possible many weeks in advance. People would quickly grow accustomed to doing something

definite over each holiday. They would make the necessary arrangements to travel, to go on automobile trips or short cruises, hike, golf, go to visit one another, or do a thousand other things which would stimulate buying and the sale of tires, gas, automobiles, clothes, shoes, sporting goods, railroad and steamship tickets, hotel accommodations, and so forth. The effect of this would be inevitably to put more money into circulation and increase and safeguard employment. Calendar reform is therefore a powerful economic weapon against depression and the adoption of The World Calendar at this time, when so many far more radical changes are daily being put into effect, is not only a common sense matter but a necessity.

Almost an infinite number of reformed calendars other than The World Calendar have been proposed; over two hundred, I have been told. Some of them have been planned on a thirteen month basis. To my mind the 12-month basis is however vastly preferable and it fills equally well travel's main need which is an orderly and common sense placing of the holidays.

The obvious inconveniences of the 13-month calendar, the added costs and effort of rendering and paying bills, the lack of convenient and easily anticipated quarter and half-yearly periods rule out this proposal from serious consideration. To this I would like to add the thought of how appalling to many of those who follow the sea would be the prospect, year after year, of thirteen Fridays falling on the thirteenth. To those who feel this argument unduly superstitious and fantastic I suggest that they look through some steamship sailing schedules and see how carefully sailings are planned to avoid this ill-omened date. I would also like them to note how, should a boat be scheduled to sail on such a date, it will almost always contrive to leave, not on Friday the thirteenth, but at 12:01 a.m. on Saturday the fourteenth.

So far as navigation is concerned, there is of course no question between the merits of the 12 and 13-month calendar proposals. The United States Bureau of Navigation has, for example, strongly approved the 12-month World Calendar and has definitely registered its opposition to the rival 13-month system. The advantages of the former are obvious; the differences from present practice unimportant.

In the case of a change such as a modification of the calendar, the necessary period of transition must be borne in mind. Our present calendar was introduced in 1582 by Gregory XIII. It was not adopted in England and the colonies until nearly 200 years afterwards. Over one-third of all the litigation in England for the following 70 years was directly caused by this slight change. Some countries, after over 330 years, have only recently fallen into line and adopted this necessary revision in their calendar systems. How long it would take the world to

adopt the 13-month calendar one hardly dares to contemplate, one fears an almost astronomic period would have to intervene.

One of The World Calendar's most striking points is the very slight readjustments that its adoption would entail, yet the great simplification of many problems that would result.

Any calendar revision with the exception of The World Calendar would enormously increase the work of the navigator without affording in any way proportionate advantages. Any other calendar would require complete revision and re-calculation of all navigational tables, without which no ship could cross the sea. These tables are published many years in advance, not only in America, but in every country in the world. The scrapping of all these tables and the necessary revision into some new system would entail the most enormous and quite unnecessary expense. The accustoming of navigators to so radical a change would also prove an appalling and needless inconvenience.

Calculations for the determination of their positions at sea are the most important duty of navigators and mariners. Upon the accuracy of these calculations depends the safety of the ship.

The introduction of an unnecessary and unaccustomed system and the substitution of cruel and unusual calculations based on a thirteen instead of a twelve months' cycle would enormously increase, during the transition period, the hazards and risks of the sea; for an error in calculation might easily bring consequences which one hesitates to contemplate because of the possible loss of life and property involved.

The World Calendar provides us with a system of the greatest simplicity, efficiency, economy and convenience. Its adoption at this time would be one of the easiest steps forward we could take.

## CALENDAR'S BIRTHDAY

*By* Arthur M. Harding, Ph.D., *University of Arkansas*

(From the Providence *Journal*, Oct. 14, 1934)

TOMORROW, on October 15, our calendar has a birthday. When and where was it born and how old is it? This old world of ours has been rocking along a number of years, but our calendar is not as old as some of us might think.

From very early times people have regulated their lives in accordance with some kind of a calendar. At first they lived by the moon, and later by the sun. Finally Julius Caesar gave the world a very remarkable calendar that was used for about 16 centuries. Then it became evident that the year as fixed by Caesar was 11 minutes and 14 seconds too long.

Pope Gregory sought the advice of astronomers and in 1582 he decided to revise the calendar. To bring it up to date, he decreed that the day after Oct. 4, 1582, should be Oct. 15, instead of Oct. 5.

Thus we see that the Gregorian calendar under which we are living went into effect just 352 years ago tomorrow.

Although this calendar has given fairly good service for 3½ centuries, it is not entirely accurate and is far from satisfactory. Let us hope that it will soon be discarded in favor of The World Calendar, which is attracting so much attention today.

# INTEREST OF THE CHURCHES

*From the Union Seminary Review*

Published by the Professors and Students of the Union Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Richmond, Va.

FOR thousands of years religion, with its discernment of eternity, has been concerned with the calendar as a measurement of time. To furnish the community with the best calendar possible has been among the social yet sacred obligations of the church.

In the astrology that sought for man's destiny in the stars, there may have been much superstition. But there was genuine science in the effort to measure the progress of the sun and the moon in their orbits and to develop a logical arrangement of days, weeks, months and years.

Throughout the world there is a growing and insistent conviction that the time has come for another attempt to reform the calendar. The importance of an adequate calendar to statisticians, scientific and industrial, does not need to be emphasized. It has been demonstrated by graphs and mathematical proofs of every kind. The subject is under the consideration of the League of Nations, the International Chamber of Commerce, the Universal Christian Council and other authorities.

In the problem, today as heretofore, the churches should display a traditional and never-failing interest. As Dr. S. Parkes Cadman recently wrote, in congratulating Archbishop Germanos of the Eastern Orthodox Church on a statement endorsing calendar reform: "The churches of the West are challenged by this statement, summarizing the attitude of the Eastern churches. Not a few of the leaders of the Western Church have hitherto failed to see why they should be interested in this question. My friend Archbishop Germanos has not forgotten that throughout the centuries the Church has functioned in successive revisions of the calendar and that its present form bears the name of a Pope."

One sacred festival deserves and is receiving special attention. For many years there has been a movement in favor of fixing the date of Easter, and, while calendar reform as a whole does not depend on such an arrangement, it would be obviously of great advantage, especially in countries where Easter is generally observed as a national holiday.

The date of Easter involves no question of faith or worship. But it has been regarded as a symbol of ecclesiastical authority. At the synod of Whitby in the year 664 the Welsh and Roman Catholic priests met to decide upon Easter, and adoption of Roman time and ritual has been accepted as a significant submission, twelve centuries ago, to Papal desires.

In the Parliament of Great Britain there has been passed an enabling Act empowering the government to declare a fixed Easter if and when

there is agreement on the subject between the churches and other authorities concerned. Climatic conditions vary in different countries. But Professor Eginitis, who for many years represented the Œcumenical Patriarch of Constantinople on Calendar Reform, presented an official report on the whole subject, dated June 23rd, 1931. He accepts in principle the advisability of a fixed Easter and expresses the opinion that the second Sunday in April would be the most convenient day for the festival. The present position of the Roman Catholic Church is that the subject should be referred to an Œcumenical Council.

The date of Easter is chiefly of importance to countries where Easter is specially observed. But there is a general reform of the calendar that concerns all mankind. It is among the benefits that churches as well as governments—with the broad perspective that is possible in churches—owe to mankind, and it so happens that the matter is urgent because there are reasons of convenience—to be explained in due course—for determining the new calendar in time for its adoption on January 1, 1939.

The fact now to be faced is a fact that never before has faced mankind. For the first time the whole of the world has been discovered and included in our maps. For the first time distance has been subordinated to science. A voice speaking anywhere is immediately heard everywhere. A deed done anywhere is immediately known everywhere. The time of day in any place must be correlated precisely with the time of day in every other place. We may not yet have arrived at universal language. But at every moment, throughout the year, day or night, a calendar, virtually universal, is in perpetual use, and this is the calendar, which, inevitably, has been brought under reasonable examination.

We owe our calendar to a wisdom that arises out of thousands of years of progressive experience. The Mohammedan Calendar is based upon the phases of the moon. The universal calendar is not lunar but solar and its unit is a year of 365 days 5 and a fraction hours. We cannot alter the length of the year by so much as an instant of time. That length is determined by the exact observations of the astronomer.

The first problem that has had to be solved by calendar reformers is thus the most formidable problem. How are we to synchronize the day and the year of 365 days and a fraction of a day? In A. D. 325 the annual and the diurnal clocks kept time with one another. But in 1582 it was found that the annual clock had gained 10 days, and Pope Gregory XIII issued a Bull cutting out those 10 days. October 5 of that year was dated October 15.

That surgical operation on Father Time corrected the discrepancy which had developed. But there remained the question how to prevent a similar discrepancy arising in the future, and it was with equal courage and ingenuity that the annual clock was regulated. An allowance had to

be made for 5 hours 48 minutes 59.7 seconds annually, and three adjustments were worked out:

(1) Every normal fourth year was to be a Leap Year of 366 days. This provided for an excess of 6 hours.
(2) The real excess is only 5 hours 48 minutes 59.7 seconds, and in order to allow for the deficiency of 11 minutes 0.3 seconds, Leap Year is omitted at the beginning of each normal century.
(3) To make the adjustment still more exact, Leap Year is *not* omitted at the beginning of every fourth century, namely, 2000, 2400 and so on.

The result of this farsighted and by no means obvious arrangement is that the year and the day are now in practically perfect rhythm, nor is it possible to contemplate the achievement without admiration for the cleverness and persistence of calendar reformers of an earlier period. They did their work well.

We have thus to take for granted a year of 365 or 366 days and examine how it is divided. We have seen how the year is adjusted to the day. How are the month and the week to be adjusted?

The existing arrangement is so anomalous as to be amusing. In the words of the rhyme:

Thirty days hath September,
April, June and November,
All the rest have thirty-one,
Saving February alone.

And February has only 28 or, in a Leap Year, 29 days. For such a calendar there is clearly no argument that now has weight save that we have grown up with it.

It is to the Romans that we owe our division of the year into months. Originally, the Roman year had ten months, namely, Martius, Aprilis, Maius, Junius, Quintilis, Sextilis, September, October, November, December. At a very early date, two months, Januarius and Februarius, were added, and it is impressive to observe that since the days of Numa Pompilius, about 26 centuries ago, ten out of these twelve ancient names have been in use. In honor of Julius Cæsar, they changed Quintilis to what we now call July, and Augustus changed Sextilis to August.

About the irregularities in our calendar there is thus no mystery. In the Roman Republic there were "political manoeuvres," involving terms of office, and according to the Encyclopaedia Britannica "the calendar got into hopeless confusion." It is true that Julius Cæsar and Augustus reduced the months to something like order. But the irregularities were not wholly eliminated. For instance, Augustus did not want his month—the month in which he was born—to be shorter than July, and he transferred, therefore, a day from February to August, which thus has 31 instead of 30 days. Manifestly there is no reason why, in the twentieth century, we should be bound by the whims of a Roman Emperor. What we

have to consider and all that we have to consider is logic and convenience.

A year of 365 or 366 days is awkward to deal with. The numeral 365 equals 5x73, and the numeral 366 equals 2x183, none of which factors are of any use to us in arranging for weeks and months.

There is thus a preliminary on which all responsible calendar reformers are agreed. They propose that a year of 364 days be assumed and at once they arrive at important results. For the number 364 splits into 4 by 7 by 13, which factors are, in certain respects, well suited to the purpose which we have in view.

First, the year, as proposed, contains an exact number of weeks, namely 52. Secondly, the year contains exactly four quarters, each of 13 weeks. The reformed year, the quarter and the week exactly synchronize.

The results which immediately follow are far-reaching:

(1) Since the year contains an exact number of weeks, a particular day of the year always falls on the same weekday. If a person is born on a Wednesday, his birthday will no longer progress annually by a day (or two days on a Leap Year) to Thursday, Friday and so on. His birthday will always be on a Wednesday.

(2) It is proposed that the year shall begin on a Sunday, or first day of the week, and end on a Saturday, or seventh day of the week. This means that all weekly wages and statistics will be exactly calculable in terms of the year. The odd days of the broken weeks at the beginning and the end of the year in the existing Gregorian Calendar do not appear in The World Calendar.

(3) The inequality between different quarters of the year will be corrected. At present the quarters are as follows—90 days or 91 days during Leap Year, 91 days, 92 days, and 92 days. In future each quarter will contain exactly 91 days, and quarterly payments of every kind will cover this uniform period.

(4) Each quarter will (like the year itself) begin on a Sunday or first day of the week and end on a Saturday or seventh day of the week. The quarters, like the year, will be exactly similar, and the first, second and third months in each quarter will be exactly similar to the first, second and third months respectively in every other quarter. In the reformed calendar, we have thus identically arranged months as follows:

First Months of Every Quarter—January, April, July, October.
Second Months of Every Quarter—February, May, August, November.
Third Months of Every Quarter—March, June, September, December.

Whatever may be the year, first months begin on a Sunday, second months begin on a Wednesday and third months begin on a Friday.

We have now to consider the important question what is to happen to the months themselves. There has been a proposal to divide the year into 13 months, each of 4 weeks. It is not necessary here to consider

that proposal at any length. There are two grave objections: First, it destroys the convenient and traditional division of the year into quarters, and to this extent is actually retrograde. In the 13-month calendar there is no half year.

The second objection is even more serious. Unless calendar reform be broadly international, it merely adds to the present confusion. There is little if any possibility to any general adoption of a 13-month year throughout the world. In many countries—including the British Commonwealth of Nations, Japan, Holland and Italy—the dislike of a 13-month calendar is unmistakable and opposition is certain.

In the report of Professor Eginitis, presented to the Œcumenical Patriarch of Constantinople and dated June 23, 1931, to which allusion has already been made, the 13-month year is described as "too radical" and it is pointed out that "the resulting number of months is no longer divisible exactly into halves and quarters." Dr. Eginitis adds:

"The 12-month equal-quarter plan, on the other hand, gives a correspondence of monthdays and weekdays in quarterly periods rather than monthly. But it does not upset the universal habit of the 12-month year; it does not affront existing customs. It introduces approximate equality of months and full equality of quarters; it provides a perpetual calendar, and it makes every quarter exactly similar in weekday sequence. It offers greater possibility of acceptance than the 13-month plan."

The reformed calendar secures an ordered twelve month arrangement. It reduces the inequalities to a minimum. Eight months have 30 days, four months have 31 days, and there is no short and variable February. Also the equalities are averaged throughout the year.

The reform of the calendar has to be undertaken at a moment when industrial conditions are peculiarly favorable to the changes. Whatever measure of importance we attach to technocratic theories, it is obvious that labor-saving machinery is winning leisure for the workers. There is a shortening of hours of labor. There are holidays. Calendar reform regularizes and develops admitted benefits of the public holiday.

The astronomical year contains 365 or 366 days. The reformed year contains 364 days. Hence, there must be one or—in Leap Year—two days when the calendar is allowed a vacation, and these days are added to the pleasurable festivals of mankind. It is proposed that such a day be intercalated between December 30 and January 1. It would be known provisionally as Year Day. Also, in Leap Years, a second day would be intercalated between June 30 and July 1. Provisionally, it would be known as Leap Day. We use the word "provisionally" because there is no reason why Year Day and Leap Day should not be dedicated by Nations or the League of Nations or by Churches to national, international or religious celebrations, whether of great memories in the

past or of great hopes for the future. The difficulty of adjusting the year to 364 days is thus transformed into an actual advantage to society.

The holidays in the year work out as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Year Day | follows December 30 | Extra Saturday |
| New Year's Day | January 1 | Sunday |
| Lincoln's Birthday | February 12 | Sunday |
| Washington's Birthday | February 22 | Wednesday |
| Easter Day | April 8 | Sunday |
| Decoration Day | May 30 | Thursday |
| Leap Day | follows June 30 | Extra Saturday |
| Independence Day | July 4 | Wednesday |
| Labor Day | September 4 | Monday |
| Columbus Day | October 12 | Thursday |
| Election Day | November 7 | Tuesday |
| Armistice Day | November 11 | Saturday |
| Thanksgiving Day | November 30 | Thursday |
| Christmas Day | December 25 | Monday |

The calendar thus provides for long week-ends, which in churches and secular organizations might be used for conferences and social purposes.

An additional advantage happens to be that the first Sunday in Advent falls on the first Sunday in December, and Whitsunday falls on the last Sunday in May. Thus The World Calendar is naturally divided according to the significance of the Church Calendar. Six months are devoted to the Life of Christ and six months to the Trinity Sundays.

The churches accept a responsibility, direct or indirect, for all that affects the happiness of man. Any practical reform, however simple, that draws nations together into friendly discussion, that leads them away from dangerous rivalries and promotes good feeling among responsible statesmen is to be welcomed as an assistance to peace. On its merits, Calendar Reform is worth while, and when the reformed calendar comes into operation the only surprise will be that it was not adopted long ago.

For the numerous discussion groups in churches there could be no more interesting occasion than an evening devoted to an explanation of The World Calendar. The subject evokes discussion. For instance, the Orthodox Church has gone further than any other great church body, holding that such a reform has an important bearing on church unity and a deep religious meaning in its tendency to unify and stabilize the church calendars of all the great communions.

Church discussion groups will find it fairly obvious that in this matter a strong lead by the English-speaking peoples would be followed by other nations. They will find that The World Calendar—whether formally adopted or not—is in international practice the easiest to use.

# EXCERPTS AND REVIEWS

## *German Church Opinion*

*By* HERMANN RISCHE

(From *Junge Front*, Roman Catholic organ published in Berlin)

THE BEST proposal for calendar reform seems to be the 12-month equal-quarter plan. This has been characterized by Cardinal Ehrle, late librarian and recorder of the Roman Catholic Church, as "having the big advantage of making no more changes in the present calendar than are absolutely necessary."

There are two other proposals which have attracted attention in Germany. One is the 13-month scheme advocated by Moses B. Cotsworth. Another is a plan for introducing a 6-day week, with five of them in each month. Both of these proposals are mechanical plans, whereas the 12-month equal-quarter calendar provides an "organic" division of the year.

Cotsworth's calendar breaks with traditions that are more than a thousand years old. It invalidates comparisons with the past, requiring difficult computations when referring to the dates of recurring events such as markets, vacations, birthdays and other anniversaries. It involves the subdivision of the year by the use of the awkward figure 13. It forces us to count the quarter-years in fractional periods of 3¼ months, the half-years in periods of 6½ months, thereby complicating greviously the whole accounting system of our economic life. The 6-day week plan, too, is more of a calendar revolution than a reform.

But the 12-month equal-quarter calendar offers, with few shortcomings, all the desired improvements. And it is entirely practical.

Its introduction of the "supplementary days" known as Year Day and Leap Day may strike one, on first consideration, as strange. But this device is essential to every proposal for a perpetual calendar. Once it is accepted, the advantages of the 12-month equal-quarter plan become evident.

The Vatican will, of course, have to give further consideration to the matter, and the nations will want to choose a time when political, social and economic conditions are favorable. But it may be expected that the campaign for reform, which is now under way throughout the world, will eventually triumph.

---

## *Plans for Next Year*

*By* JOSEPH KASTNER

(In *Fortune* Magazine)

THE YEAR 1935 was to be a big year for the calendar reformers. The League of Nations was to take up the two major recommendations for calendar changes. The latest word from Geneva is that nothing will be done until the early part of 1936. Probably then the League of Nations will recommend an authorized international conference such as the one called by the United States 50 years ago to consider and adopt international standard time.

The calendar reformers feel that they are making real progress. Almost anyone who studies the calendar situation admits that something ought to be done; at present months are uneven with days badly distributed and some months having more than their share of Sundays; quarters are uneven, holidays come on different weekdays each year; everything is pretty well mixed up.

Public inertia and indifference, sentimental opposition to any change, some religious opposition, have stood in the way. It took an edict of Pope Gregory XIII to start the last reform, and before that it took an edict of Julius Caesar to put the Julian calendar into effect. The League doesn't carry so much weight as a Pope or a Caesar.

While there is general agreement among reformers that the calendar should be changed, there is sharp difference on the kind of change. The 13-month year that the late George Eastman sponsored divides the year into 13 months of 28 days. Leader of the equal-quarter plan is Miss Elisabeth Achelis, who has been interested in the plan since 1930.

The World Calendar Association believes that it is very important to keep the year divisible into quarters for business reasons. More practical is its contention

that a change to a 13-month year would be too difficult to have adopted.

The Roman Catholic Church, incidentally, has always considered calendar reform its special province. It has stated that it has no dogmatic objection to the calendar change, but it won't take sides.

## *Statistical Opinion*

*By* EDWARD C. KRAUSS

(From the Los Angeles *Times*, Aug. 22, 1934)

MEMBERS of the American Statistical Association, by nearly 9 to 1, regard the present calendar as archaic, if not obsolete. By a vote of 8 to 1 they want calendar changes made within five years. They prefer, 2 to 1, the proposed 12-month equal-quarter plan to the 13-month plan.

The rival calendars have been before the public for several years, the 13-month plan having had some start on the publicity owing to the fact that it was heavily supported by the late George Eastman, the camera maker. The other proposal which seems to be favored by the statisticians by a wide margin, proposes to retain the familiar 12-month year, but makes each quarter of equal length.

Among those canvassed were big business executives, educators, bankers and financial statisticians, insurance men, utilities and government statisticians. W. T. Foster of the Pollak Foundation summed up the objections to the present calendar forcibly by saying:

"Every one of us uses the same crude calendar which Julius Caesar devised in 46 B.C., which has not been improved since, except for adjusting its leap years. There would be no objection to that, if the old calendar happened to be adjusted to present-day uses. But it is not. It makes a good job of measuring the time it takes for the earth to travel around the sun, but as a measure for shorter periods it is no good at all.

"Caesar created a jumble of months of assorted sizes to suit his personal fancy. A couple of centuries later the 7-day week appeared on the scene without so much as asking leave, and proceeded to measure time on its own hook. It would not fit the months or stay put in the year. It converted the calendar into the crazy-quilt pattern we have today. The pattern changes every year. It will be 28 years before we have another calendar exactly like the one we are using this year. Each year begins on a different day of the week and the weeks overlap the divisions of the year in a different way each year."

The 12-monthers object to the 13-month plan that it is too radical, that 13 is not divisible, that the plan would throw birthdays and holidays and anniversaries out of gear, and so on. They maintain that for statistical purposes it is more important to have equal quarters than equal months.

## *Logical Choice*

*By* DR. JOHN E. MERRILL

(From an Address at the Buffalo Museum of Science, Nov. 17, 1934.)

OUT OF the 185 different plans for calendar reform submitted to the League of Nations, The World Calendar, with its 12-month year and every quarter the same, is to be preferred to the 13-month plan or any other.

The World Calendar, to keep in line with the solar year, would make December 30 a 48-hour day each year, and June 30 a 48-hour day in each leap-year. Under it the 7-day week would be retained as a time unit, and the weekdays would be fixed to perpetual dates.

If you are selecting a calendar system to live by, The World Calendar is the logical choice. It is balanced in structure, perpetual in form, and conforms to the seasons, thus recognizing natural laws. Comparisons are easily obtained; the changes involved require a minimum of adjustment; expenses are not increased for business and consumer. Religious and secular holidays are stabilized, and transition from the old order to the new is made easy by the retention of the 12-month year.

Consider on the other hand the endless confusion in everyday life that would be produced by the adoption of a 13-month calendar. It is true that with every month beginning on Sunday some business concerns would find the 13-month calendar satisfactory in their accounting systems. But the concerns that do not employ an accountant would have no use for such a specialized calendar. It would mean altogether too much confusion and readjustment in the little things of life that mean so much to the individual.

# CURRENT PRESS COMMENT

## Chile Takes Action

*New York Times*

Chile has resolved to adopt the perpetual calendar as recommended by the World Calendar Association. After a long study, instructions will be given to the Chilean delegate to the League of Nations to back the plan for world-wide adoption.

Advantages of the calendar are said to include 26 working days a month, the fixing of religious feasts, and uniform quarterly and half-yearly periods commencing on Sundays and ending on Saturdays. The Chilean commission regards revision of the calendar as equally important with world-wide establishment of the metric system.

## Time to Begin

*New York Times*

The General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in adopting a resolution looking first of all to the stabilization of Easter, gave its support also to a "reformed calendar of twelve months with equal quarters." The proposed fixation of the Easter date has a religious meaning in that it will have an effect in unifying and stabilizing the church calendars of all the great communions, both Catholic and Protestant, both Western and Eastern. This recognition of a conscious advance toward a world unity may be accomplished without governmental action.

The convention pronounced in favor of such revision of our civil calendar as to keep our division of the year into twelve months and at the same time to make the quarters of equal length.

It is urged in support of such a calendar that in its even quarters it conforms to the seasons, "recognizing natural laws," that it makes more easily possible the comparisons between quarters, that the proposed changes would require a minimum of adjustment, without increase of expenses for business or the consumer, that it would stabilize both religious and secular holidays and effect a transition from the old to the new order with greater facility because of the retention of the twelve-month year.

For the Easter stabilization the successor of GREGORY should have the privilege of taking the lead. For the wider reform of the calendar the League of Nations has undertaken an inquiry. The preamble of the resolution adopted by the Episcopal Convention recites the fact that the studies and inquiries so begun have revealed "an overwhelming proportion" of churches openly in support both of the stabilization of Easter, now set for April 8, and the reform of the calendar, but still a calendar with the "time-honored division of the year into twelve months." It is a fit time to begin a stabilized calendar as the world rises out of its despair, and it would be profitable to mankind to set apart one day a year as "world day."

## Federal Council Report

*New York Times*

Proposals for agreement between the three great branches of the Christian Church—Catholic, Protestant and Greek Orthodox—concerning fixed dates for Easter and other feasts and related fundamental calendar reform, were made public by the Federal Council of Churches at its annual convention in Dayton.

While calendar reform, with its important effects on ecclesiastical observance, does not occupy first importance in the agenda of the Council's sessions, it is regarded as significant of new cooperation. This importance is pointed out in the report of the Council's department of relations with churches abroad, of which Dr. S. Parkes Cadman is chairman.

"For the first time in modern history all the churches of the world have actually been consulted on a specific question, and replies are now in hand which seem likely to lead the League of Nations to proceed with its plan," the Cadman report states, adding that "one result will be that instead of having Christians celebrating Easter, Christmas and other festivals on different dates, the whole Christian world will at least be one in this particular."

# JOURNAL OF CALENDAR REFORM

EDITORS

CHARLES D. MORRIS CHARLES C. SUTTER

*Published by*

The World Calendar Association, 485 Madison Avenue, New York City

ELISABETH ACHELIS, *President*

VOL. IV DECEMBER, 1934 No. 4

THERE is a Chinese story about a farmer who at his death left eleven sheep to his three sons, with the following bequest: that to his eldest be given one-half the number of sheep, to the second son one quarter, and to the youngest two-thirds of the remainder.

This strange division greatly perplexed and distressed the sons, until a distinguished mathematician showed them a way of solving their problem. He told them to go to a neighbor and ask for the loan of one sheep. With this borrowed sheep the sons now had twelve animals, which they could distribute in accordance with the wish of their venerable father. The eldest son received one-half the number, or six sheep; the second son received one-quarter, or three sheep; the youngest received two-thirds of the remainder, or two sheep. When the borrowed animal had thus performed its duty, the sons returned it to their neighbor.

The Chinese story illustrates one of the problems that confronts calendar reformers. Their problem is: How can the calendar of 365 days be evenly divided into its various parts?

By a somewhat similar process to that used in the Chinese story, the odd 365th day is temporarily removed, so that the problem may be solved. The year now consists of 364 days, a number which is suitably divisible. The 364 days may be divided into equal quarters of 91 days and equal halves of 182 days. They may be divided into exactly 52 weeks of seven days each, giving 13 weeks to each quarter and 26 weeks to each half year. The 12 months, apportioned into quarters of 3 months, on a basis of 31, 30 and 30 days, provide months of exactly 26 weekdays throughout the year.

With the problem thus satisfactorily solved, the odd 365th day—like the borrowed sheep in the Chinese story—is returned to the calendar and placed at the end of the year, thus completing the perpetual and changeless calendar.

# FROM THE MAILBAG

You may rest assured that I shall do my utmost in order to promote amongst the Belgian authorities the 12-month equal-quarter proposal of the World Calendar. In this respect I am pleased to tell you that I am also in touch with French friends who advocate this solution, which is certainly the simplest and the most practical.—P. L. Dupont, Managing Director, Central Match Co., Uccle, Belgium.

There are certain advantages in the fixed calendar. The churches may have some interest in the plan but it is a matter chiefly of business interest. Personally I believe that the 12-month plan would be far the better. The initiative should be taken by the Government, by all means. It is a matter foremost for them.—Rev. F. H. Throop, Columbus, Ohio.

I am heartily in favor of a reformed calendar. The 12-month proposal endorsed by the World Calendar Association should have a universal appeal.—J. R. Gilley, Comptroller, University of Toronto.

The claim that the absolute sameness of all months, as in the 13-month plan, is an advantage I think is a mistake.—Rev. W. D. Street, White Plains, N. Y.

I most heartily endorse the World Calendar. Hope to see it adopted.—L. C. Hunt, Supt. of Schools, Burlington, Vt.

Twelve-month equal-quarter plan is more practical than the 13-month plan, would accomplish the desired reform and at the same time cause the least confusion. —B. Gadeholt, Northwestern Elec. Co., Portland, Ore.

The 12-month equal-quarter would have two distinct advantages. (1) It would involve a minimum of confusions in the transition. (2) It recognizes the natural law of seasons.—Prof. R. P. Eastwood, School of Business, Columbia Univ.

I believe changes in the present calendar to a 12-month equal-quarter plan would result in material economy in calculations of time data and greater accuracy in the presentation of statistical information.—O. E. Baker, Bur. Agri. Econ., Washington, D. C.

The 13-month plan is an innovation with nothing historical or practical to commend it.—Rev. S. Billheimer, Palmyra, Pa.

Can readily see benefits to be derived from the World Calendar in connection with average business man's daily monthly tasks.—A. H. Iliohan, Oakland, Cal.

Twelve-month, by all means. I regard the 13-month plan as worse than the present.—C. E. Gehlke, Prof. Western Reserve Univ., Cleveland, O.

My age is 75 and I am looking forward to the time when the World Calendar will be in use throughout the world and especially in our own country.—J. H. Kreider, Pres., Porterville Battery Works, Porterville, Cal.

Our present plan is inaccurate and confusing. Hard for general public to understand and especially children. It confuses business interests. The people in general can understand the 12-month equal-quarter plan. The churches will approve it.—Rev. H. F. Brooks, Tupelo, Miss.

I think the reform of calendar advisable, and the best one that of "The World Calendar." Time will come when your idea will win. I think so.—Rev. Leopoldo Ruiz, Archbishop, Morelia, Mex.

Why not another "Lausanne Conference" (on calendar reform) with the participation of Rome? Mayhap this mutual interest would bring closer a Christian unity!—Rev. R. A. Kentz, Buffalo, N. Y.

I am going to study the proposed question (calendar reform) and in due time notify His Holiness Pope Pius XI about my point of view.—Andrew Szeptyckyj, Archbishop of Leopoli, Lwow, Poland.

From statistical point of view, I am absolutely in accordance with the idea.—M. Conde Garriga, Barcelona, Spain.

I hope that the 12-month equal-quarters revision calendar will in time be adopted internationally.—Claire Richardson, Elmira College, Elmira, N. Y.

This plan appears feasible and practical and involves a minimum of dislocation.—William E. Clark, Lawyer, Bedford, Ind.

# MEMBERS OF THE WORLD CALENDAR ASSOCIATION

485 Madison Avenue, New York City

AMERICAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

George Gordon Battle
Henry W. Bearce
Dr. S. Parkes Cadman
Capt. J. F. Hellweg, U. S. N.
Wm. M. Kingsley
Bishop William T. Manning
Charles S. McVeigh
Prof. Wm. Starr Myers
Prof. H. Parker Willis

FOREIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Prof. P. Stroobant (Belgium)
Erland Echlin (Canada)
Dr. H. Blume (Danzig)
C. David Stelling (England)
Paul-Louis Hervier (France)
Abraham Frowein (Germany)
Athanase Politis (Greece)
Amedeo Giannini (Italy)
I. Gajardo Reyes (S. America)
Raymond Mage (Switzerland)

*Membership is based on an active interest in the study of an adequate and effective improvement of the calendar. Owing to lack of space, a large number of names have been omitted. They will be printed in future issues.*

T. F. Adams, Clergyman, Toledo, Ohio.
E. E. Agger, Prof., New Brunswick, N. J.
A. D. Anderson, Publicity, New York City.
Harlan Bailey, Clergyman, San Francisco.
F. A. Barber, Historian, New York City.
Walter Barlow, Clergyman, Ames, Iowa
W. D. Baten, Prof., Ann Arbor, Mich.
Spurgeon Bell, Research, Washington, D. C.
Julius Bisom, Statistician, Albany.
E. G. Black, Clergyman, Flint, Mich.
Guy Bogart, Public Relations, Beaumont.
A. G. Bohne, Statistician, New York City.
Castro Bonel, Prof., Madrid, Spain.
Witt Bowden, Economist, Washington, D. C.
H. D. Brown, Clergyman, Lynchburg, Va.
R. D. Calkins, Prof., Berkeley, Cal.
J. W. Carman, Clergyman, Denver.
Chabot Observatory, Oakland, Cal.
Chairman, U. S. Shipping Board, Wash.
Chamber of Commerce, Paris, France.
M. W. Clair, Bishop, Covington, Ky.
F. J. Clark, Clergyman, New York City.
F. B. Cliffe, Statistician, Schenectady.
P. B. Coggins, Statistician, Newark, N. J.
J. M. Coleman, Clergyman, Brooklyn.
E. L. Commons, Lumber, Richmond, Ind.
Conn. Hist. Socy., Hartford, Conn.
W. T. Cook, Prof., New Rochelle, N. Y.
C. F. Crathern, Clergyman, Bedford, N. H.
D. A. Crocker, Code Authority, New York.
E. M. Cross, Bishop, Spokane, Wash.
W. W. Cumberland, Economist, New York City.
Dacca Univ. Library, Bengal, India.
Dela. State Medical Journal, Wilmington.
Frederic Dewhurst, Economist, New York.
E. L. Dodd, Prof., Austin, Tex.
P. H. Douglas, Prof., Chicago.
Florence DuBois, Statistician, New York.
Ducal Observatory, Gotha, Germany.
J. W. Dunlap, Prof., New York City.
Julius Dupont, Merchant, Houma, La.
Pio Emanuelli, Astronomer, Rome, Italy.
N. H. Engle, Dept. of Commerce, Wash.
B. A. Faris, Prof., Beirut, Syria.
J. A. Folse, Museum Curator, Chicago.
Eduard Fontsere, Prof., Barcelona, Spain.
T. B. Foster, Clergyman, Rutland, Vt.
E. E. Freudenthal, Statistician, New York.
L. K. Friedman, Actuary, Houston, Tex.
C. L. Fry, Prof., Rochester, N. Y.
A. W. Garden, Clergyman, Pittsburgh.
J. M. Glenn, Social Worker, New York City.
C. A. Glover, Economist, Montclair, N. J.
H. V. Gocher, Astronomer, Berlin, Germany.
G. C. Graham, Clergyman, Wilmington, Dela.
H. D. Griffin, Prof., Wayne, Neb.
G. L. Haehle, Statistician, New York City.
Y. J. Hayasaki, Social Work, Tokyo, Japan.
E. R. Henry, Prof., New York City.
A. J. Hills, C. N. R., Montreal, Canada.
Jeanette Homan, Statistician, New York.
J. B. Hubbard, Educator, Cambridge, Mass.
Emile Jottrand, Prof., Brussels, Belgium.
M. T. Kao, Business, Shanghai, China.
S. E. Keeler, Bishop, Minneapolis.
L. S. Kellogg, Statistician, Buffalo, N. Y.
D. C. Kerr, Accountant, Salt Lake City.
E. M. Keyser, Meteorologist, Spokane.
B. F. Kimball, Mathematician, Albany.
G. L. Kirk, Prof., Madison, Wis.
Samuel Klein, Business, New York City.
A. C. Knowles, Clergyman, Philadelphia.
A. A. Kopff, Prof., Berlin, Germany.
A. E. Kripke, Actuary, Schenectady.
M. R. Kulp, Irrigationist, Moscow, Idaho.
Ladd Observatory, Providence, R. I.
R. F. Lau, Clergyman, New York City.
Albert Logette, Insurance, Montreal.
Elizabeth Long, Social Worker, Columbus.
W. V. Longley, Educator, Truro, Canada.
Kao Lou, Supervisor, Nanking, China.
W. T. Lytle, Clergyman, Pittsburgh.
Mary Macaulay, Lecturer, London, England.
G. G. MacCurdy, Prof., Old Lyme, Conn.
B. B. Marcello, Prof., Milan, Italy.
E. W. Marcellus, Am. Red Cross, Washington.
A. W. Marget, Prof., Minneapolis.
D. L. Marsh, Univ. Pres., Boston.
J. F. Martin, Agronomist, Pendleton, Ore.
W. R. Martin, Dir. Museum, Roanoke, Va.
T. E. Mason, Prof., W. Lafayette, Ind.
Antoine Masson, Business, Verviers, Belgium.
M. H. Mattes, Organist, Cranberry Lake, N. J.
W. C. Maynard, Lawyer, Schenectady, N. Y.
D. H. McAllister, Engr., Los Angeles.
H. F. McColly, Engr., Fargo, N. D.
C. F. Mercer, School Supt., Lynwood, Cal.
H. P. Metcalf, Clergyman, Warwick, Mass.
R. W. Michaud, Statistician, New York City.
C. S. Miller, Surgeon, Philadelphia.
Adrian Mints, Accountant, Brooklyn.
E. B. Mittelman, Prof., Eugene, Ore.
S. G. Montgomery, Clergyman, Philadelphia.
John W. Morss, Lawyer, Boston.
National Academy, Peiping, China.
J. M. Nelson, Clergyman, Louisville, Ky.
A. A. Nijland, Prof., Utrecht, Holland.
Observatory, Athens, Greece.
Observatory, Milan, Italy.
Observatory, Santiago, Chile.
Observatory, Toulouse, France.
William Ogden, Business, Chicago.
Ashton Oldham, Bishop, Albany.
E. L. Oliver, Research, Cincinnati.

B. K. Orr, School Supt., Waukon, Iowa.
F. V. Owen, Biologist, Salt Lake City.
C. F. Painter, Physician, Boston.
F. D. Parker, Clergyman, Hartford, Conn.
G. H. Parker, Prof., Cambridge, Mass.
W. A. Parker, School Supt., Tarrant, Ala.
W. F. Perry, Clergyman, Lincoln, Neb.
S. I. Posner, Economist, Washington, D. C.
H. S. Randolph, Editor, New York City.
V. M. Reyes, Educator, La Paz, Bolivia.
J. W. Robinson, Bishop, Delhi, India.
S. C. Roy, Astronomer, Bombay, India.
Royal Bank of Canada Library, Montreal.
J. L. Scott, Clergyman, Louisville, Ky.
A. N. Smith, Clergyman, Newark, N. J.
E. D. Smith, Engineer, New York City.
J. W. Smith, Banking, Philadelphia.
H. W. Snyder, Clergyman, Washington, D. C.
Irving Spencer, Clergyman, Los Angeles.
W. M. Stevens, Prof., Baton Rouge, La.
H. L. Stratton, Clergyman, Worcester, Mass.
T. T. Tharayil, Prof., Kottayam, India.
Otto Thiel, Prof., Quincy, Ill.
A. S. Thomas, Bishop, Charleston, S. C.
J. T. Thomas, Clergyman, Springfield, Ill.
T. S. Thompson, Clergyman, St. Paul, Minn.
W. B. Thorp, Clergyman, Palo Alto, Cal.
W. S. Thyng, Advertising, Seattle.
Alex. Toth, Prof., Lancaster, Pa.
E. T. Townie, Prof., Grand Forks, N. D.
F. W. Trezise, Prof., Appleton, Wis.
F. L. Troyer, News Editor, Toronto, Canada.
R. W. Tyler, Physicist, Rochester, N. Y.
P. S. Vaitses, Code Authority, Cambridge.
H. W. Van Pelt, Statistician, Harrisburg.
E. H. Voges, Statistician, Indianapolis.
Philip Vollmer, Clergyman, Cleveland.
V. S. Von Szeliski, Statistician, Wash.
Louis Voss, Clergyman, New Orleans.
G. G. Wacker, Clergyman, Brooklyn.
H. K. Wagner, Lawyer, St. Louis.
John Wagner, Clergyman, Hazleton, Pa.
J. W. Wallace, Economist, Quebec, Canada.
R. B. Wallace, Editor, Omaha, Neb.
T. F. Walsh, Clergyman, Pitman, N. J.
Brother Walter, Educator, Bengal, India.
War Dept. Law Library, Washington, D. C.
V. O. Ward, Clergyman, Faribault, Minn.
Patterson Wardlaw, Prof., Columbia, S. C.
C. A. Wardwell, Teacher, Evanston, Ill.
J. O. Warfield, Clergyman, Philadelphia.
R. J. Watson, Clergyman, Lombard, Ill.
Robert Watson, Clergyman, Boston.
F. G. Watts, Prof., Shawnee, Okla.
A. S. Weber, Clergyman, Baltimore.
R. E. Weeks, Statistician, Milwaukee.
Welch Medical Library, Baltimore.
H. C. Wendel, Prof., Brooklyn.
Roy Wenzlick, Real Estate, St. Louis.
J. F. West, School Supt., Albany, Cal.
R. B. Westerfield, Teacher, New Haven.
A. J. Weston, Engineer, Denver.
A. W. Weysse, Educator, Boston.
E. M. Weyer, Prof., Washington, Pa.
C. W. Wharton, Clergyman, Valparaiso, Ind.
J. R. Wharton, Accountant, So. Bend, Ind.
Charles Whetstone, Pub. Utility, Nyack.
H. E. White, Medical Student, Indianapolis.
Henry Wiegand, Business, New York City.
A. E. Wigeland, Statistician, Evanston.
H. O. Wiley, College Pres., Pasadena.
F. C. Wilharm, Statistician, Pittsburgh.
R. I. Wilkinson, Tel. Co., New York City.
F. P. Willes, Clergyman, Croom, Md.
Arthur Williams, Business, Chicago.
F. L. Williams, Lawyer, St. Louis.
M. B. Williams, Clergyman, Marshall, Mo.
G. A. Wilson, Instructor, Claremont, Cal.
George Wilson, Clergyman, Rockaway, N. Y.
George Winchester, Prof., New Brunswick.
J. D. Wing, Bishop, Winter Park, Fla.
Marshall Wingfield, Clergyman, Amory, Miss.
Max Winkler, Economist, New York City.
C. G. Wolf, Clergyman, Baltimore.
William Wolf, Lumber, Pacific, Mo.
Clyde Wolfe, Educator, Pasadena, Cal.
Moses Wolinsky, Statistician, New York.
T. W. Woo, Student, London, England.
C. W. Wood, Educator, Valley City, N. D.
D. J. Woods, Clergyman, Clinton, S. C.
G. I. Woodson, Teacher, Wilberforce, Ohio.
E. S. Worcester, Clergyman, New Brunswick.
H. M. Workman, Surgeon, Tracy, Minn.
W. H. Wotring, Clergyman, Nazareth, Pa.
J. P. Wozencraft, Weather Bur., Cincinnati.
F. B. Wright, Statistician, Berkeley, Cal.
T. K. Wu, City Official, Canton, China.
Eugen Wurzburger, Prof., Leipzig, Germany.
Rosa Wyatt, Teacher, New Orleans.
J. W. Yost, Statistician, New York City.
Leonard Young, School Supt., Duluth, Minn.
O. R. Young, Editor, New York City.
W. S. Young, Clergyman, Los Angeles.
G. J. Yundt, Tel. Co., Atlanta.
R. H. Zalles, Author, New York City.
O. B. Zimmerman, Agri. Engr., Chicago.

## INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS FOR REFORM OF THE CALENDAR

BELGIUM: Belgian National Committee on Calendar Reform, Prof. P. Stroobant, Secy., Royal Observatory, Brussels.

CANADA: Rational Calendar Association, Erland Echlin, Secy., 268 Glenlake Ave., Toronto.

DENMARK: Danish Calendar Reform Committee, Axel Gerfalk, Secy., 33 Amaliegade, Copenhagen.

ENGLAND: Rational Calendar Association, C. David Stelling, Secy., 38 Parliament Street, London.

FRANCE: Bureau d'Etudes pour la Reforme du Calendrier, Paul Louis Hervier, Secy., 5 Rue Bernoulli, Paris.

GERMANY: German National Committee on Calendar Reform, Prof. Dr. Ernst Wageman, Secy., Instituits fur Konjunkturforschunt, Berlin.—Die Gesellschaft fur Zeitgemasse Kalenderreform, Dr. Oskar Aust, Secy., 70 Onkel-Braesigstrasse, Berlin (Britz).—Der Weltbund fur Kalenderreform, Dr. Rudolph Blochmann, Secy., 24 Lorsenstrasse, Kiel.

GREECE: Greek National Committee on Calender Reform, Prof. S. Plakidis, Secy., Observatory of Athens, Athens.

HUNGARY: Hungarian Committee for Study of Calendar Reform, Dr. Paul Vajda, Secy., 9 Eotos Utca, Budapest.

IRELAND: Irish Committee for Calendar Reform, E. K. Eason, Secy., 80 Mid. Abbey St., Dublin.

ITALY: Italian National Committee on Calendar Reform, Prof. Amedeo Giannini, Secy., Via del Seminario 113, Rome.

SOUTH AMERICA: Comite Latino-Americano del Calendario Mundial, Dr. I. Gajardo Reyes, President, Santiago, Chile. This committee directs the activities of national organizations in Brazil, Costa Rica, Uruguay, Chile, Bolivia and Panama.

SPAIN: Spanish Calendar Reform Committee, Dr. Mariano Doporto, Secy., San Sebastian.

SWITZERLAND: Swiss National Committee on Calendar Reform, Prof. Emile Marchand, Secy., 4 Jenatschstrasse, Zurich.

TURKEY: Committee on Calendar Reform, Prof. Ihsan Ali, Secy., Ayas Pasa Nimet Apt. 3, Istanbul.